

भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

साप्ताहिक

WEEKLY

सं. 30]

नई दिल्ली, जुलाई 18—जुलाई 24, 2004, शनिवार/आषाढ़ 27—श्रावण 2, 1926

No. 30]

NEW DELHI, JULY 18—JULY 24, 2004, SATURDAY/ASADHA 27—SRAVANA 2, 1926

इस भाग में धिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि वह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate Pageing is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांख्यिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्यिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय

(कार्यिक और प्रशासन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 2004

MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL,
PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS
(Department of Personnel & Training)
New Delhi, the 15th July, 2004

क्र. अ. 1721.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एवम्‌द्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 6 के साथ चरित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए गुजरात राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना संख्या जी.ओ.82/एमआईएस/292003/ओडी/4/डी दिनांक 20-09-2003 द्वारा प्राप्त गुजरात राज्य सरकार की सहमति से श्री रामवरण सिंह आर. तोमर एवं 21 अन्यो तथा किन्हीं अन्य लोक सेवकों अथवा व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध उनके कपटपूर्ण कार्यों के लिए भारतीय दंड संहिता की धारा 193, 196, 199, 200, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471, 474, 380, 120-बी के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त तथा उसी संयोजन के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों के संबंध में मामले के पंजीकरण और अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण गुजरात राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या-228/97/2003-ए.पी.डी.-(II)]

भाष्कर खुल्बे, निदेशक

S.O. 1721.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the State Government of Gujarat vide Notification No. GG/82/MIS/292003/OD/4/D dated 20-9-2003 hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Gujarat for registration of the case and investigation of offences punishable U/Sec. 193, 196, 199, 200, 420, 465, 466, 468, 471, 474, 380, 120-B IPC against Shri Ramvaran Singh R. Tomar and 21 others for their fraudulent acts, and any other public servants or persons in relation to, or in connection with the said offences, and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/97/2003-AVD-II]

BHASKAR KHULBE, Director

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1722. —केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना संख्या एचडी 87 पीसीआर 2004, दिनांक 11 मई, 2004 द्वारा प्राप्त कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार की सहमति से श्री संजय सब्बरवाल, कार्यपालक अभियंता, बीएसएनएल, सिविल डिवीजन-II, बंगलौर और किन्हीं अन्य व्यक्तियों अथवा लोक सेवकों के विरुद्ध मार्च-अप्रैल, 2004 के दौरान 6000/- रुपए घूस माँगने और स्वीकार करने के संबंध में भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 की धारा 7 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों और उपर्युक्त अपराधों में से एक अथवा अधिक से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्टरेणों और षडयंत्र तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध अथवा अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार संपूर्ण कर्नाटक राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या-228/45/2004-ए.वी.डी.-(II)]

भाष्कर खुल्बे, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 15th July, 2004

S.O. 1722.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act. No. 25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of State Government of Karnataka, vide Notification No. HD 87 PCR 2004, dated 11-5-2004 hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Karnataka for investigation of offences of demanding and accepting bribe of Rs. 6,000/- during March-April, 2004 punishable under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 against Shri Sanjay Sabharwal, Executive Engineer, BSNL, Civil Division-II, Bangalore, and any other persons or public servants and attempts, abetments and conspiracy in relation to, or in connection with one or more of the offences mentioned above, and any other offence or offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/45/2004-AVD-III]

BHASKAR KHULBE, Director

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1723. —केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और राजस्थान उच्च न्यायालय, जयपुर न्यायपीठ द्वारा बंदी प्रत्यक्षीकरण याचिका संख्या 6059/2003 में पारित आदेश दिनांक 26 मई, 2004 के अनुपालन में कुमारी पूनम के अपहरण के संबंध में पुलिस स्टेशन सूरज गढ़, जिला झुंझुनू, राजस्थान में भारती दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम संख्या 45) की धारा 363 और 366 के अधीन दर्ज मामला प्रथम सूचना

रिपोर्ट संख्या 127/2003, दिनांक 14-08-2003 और उपर्युक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त प्रयत्नों, दुष्टरेणों और षडयंत्र तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किसी अन्य अपराध अथवा अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार संपूर्ण राजस्थान राज्य पर करती है।

[संख्या-228/50/2004-ए.वी.डी.-II]

भाष्कर खुल्बे, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 15th July, 2004

S.O. 1723.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act. No. 25 of 1946) and also in compliance with the order dated 26-5-2004 passed by the Rajasthan High Court, Jaipur Bench in Habeas Corpus Petition No. 6059/2003, the Central Government hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Rajasthan for investigation of case FIR No. 127/2003, dated 14-8-2003 under Sections 363 and 366 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) registered at Police Station Suraj Garh District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan regarding Kidnapping of Km. Poonam and attempts, abetments and conspiracy in relation to or in connection with the offences mentioned above and any other offence or offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/50/2004-AVD-III]

BHASKAR KHULBE, Director

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1724. —केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का अधिनियम संख्या 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार की अधिसूचना संख्या एचडी 80 पीसीआर 2004, दिनांक 14-05-2004 द्वारा प्राप्त कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार की सहमति से

1. श्री जी.सी. चंद्रमोहन,
निदेशक,
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन।
2. श्रीमती गीता चंद्रमोहन,
निदेशक,
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन।
3. श्री वी.एल. फर्नांडिस,
निदेशक,
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन।

4. श्रीमती लयूरा फ्रान्कडिस,
निदेशक,
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन।
5. श्री एस. अनिल सुब्बाया,
प्रबंध निदेशक,
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन।
6. श्री जी. आर. संतप्पा,
प्रबंधक (वित्त),
मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
जिला हसन।
7. श्री चंद्रधर पुत्र श्री चिन्नाधिरधर,
निवासी इस्वारा मंदिर स्ट्रीट,
हसन।
8. श्री के. के. चिंगप्पा,
पुत्र श्री के. करियप्पा,
निवासी मुथाथा गांव,
एराबल्ली पोस्ट, बेल्लूर तालुक,
हसन।
9. श्री एच. एस. रमेश,
पुत्र श्री शिवाना,
निवासी उदयवार, शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
10. श्री एच. एम. रामचंद्रा,
पुत्र श्री एच.एस. मल्लिकाअर्जुनाह,
निवासी बस स्टैंड के पीछे,
शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
11. श्री बी.के. गिरीधर,
पुत्र श्री बी. एस. काशीविश्वनाथ,
निवासी मेन रोड कोडलीपेट,
सोमवारपेट तालुक,
जिला हसन।
12. श्री एच. बी. पुट्टयस्वामी,
पुत्र श्री बसप्पा,
निवासी डोडाहल्ली, निधाता पोस्ट,
शुकवारसंते, सोमवारपेट तालुक,
जिला कुर्ग।
13. श्री एच. एन. ज्ञानेश्वर राय,
पुत्र श्री नारायण राय,
निवासी 5555/ए, सैकेंड क्रॉस,
रवींद्र नगर,
जिला हसन।
14. श्री जे.सी. विध्याकिरण,
पुत्र श्री चंद्रशेखर,
निवासी चगेली,
हम्बल पोस्ट, शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
15. श्री एम. टी. सोमशेखर,
पुत्र श्री थिमागोवड़ा,
निवासी राजेंद्र पारा,
बालपेट हुबली शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
16. श्री बी.के. यतीश,
पुत्र श्री बी.एस. काशी विश्वनाथिया,
निवासी कोडलीपेट मेन, सोमवारपेट तालुक,
जिला कोडुगु।
17. श्री ए. पी. पोवाह,
पुत्र श्री पूरनाचा,
निवासी रामपुरा, चिकमंगलूर तालुका,
जिला चिकमंगलूर।
18. श्री जी. आर. संतप्पा,
पुत्र श्री राजप्पा, निवासी गोपालपुरा गांव,
सनवरपेट तालुक, जिला कोडुगु।
19. श्री सी.एच. बसप्पा,
पुत्र श्री सी. चिनप्पा,
निवासी चिनाहल्ली, एल्लूर, तालुक,
जिला हसन।
20. श्री एस.सी. अपर्णा गौड़ा,
पुत्र श्री चिन्ना गोड़ा,
निवासी श्रीधरहल्ली, अराकल गुड तालुक,
जिला हसन।
21. श्री डी. वेंकटेश,
पुत्र श्री देवगौड़ा,
निवासी देवीगिरी, कुंदार पोस्ट,
एल्लूर तालुक, जिला हसन।
22. श्री के.एस. राजशेकर,
पुत्र श्री संतप्पा,
निवासी कोडलीपेट,
सोमवारपेट तालुक,
कोडुगु जिला।
23. श्री बी.एच. नागराज,
पुत्र श्री बी. हलप्पा,
निवासी येसलूर, शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।

24. श्री बी.के. राजकुमार,
पुत्र श्री कृष्णशेकर,
निवासी शुकरावर सांथे,
शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
25. श्री बी.के. ईश्वर,
पुत्र श्री काशीविश्वनाथ,
निवासी मेन रोड, कोडलीपेट,
जिला कोडगु।
26. श्री ए.आर. सोमसुंदर,
पुत्र श्री ए.वी. राजप्पा, निवासी मेन रोड,
कोडलीपेट, जिला कोडगु।
27. के.ए. नतेश,
पुत्र श्री अनिह,
निवासी बालूपेट, शकलेशपुर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
28. श्री बी.एस. मंजूनाथ,
पुत्र श्री सुब्बाराव,
निवासी गांडीहल्ली, बेल्लूर तालुक,
जिला हसन।
29. श्री के.सी. महेश कुमार,
पुत्र श्री के.पी. चंद्रशेकर,
निवासी कंधूर, पाल्या हुबली,
एलूर तालुक, जिला हसन।
30. श्री एच.एन. कुमारस्वरूप,
पुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री एच.एल. नंजनादप्पा,
निवासी चिकन्याकरहल्ली एस्टेट,
होसालाइन रोड, जिला हसन।
31. श्री एच.एस. मोहन,
पुत्र श्री एच.सी. मोहन,
निवासी चिकन्याकरहल्ली एस्टेट,
होसालाइन रोड, जिला हसन।
32. श्री डी.एन. हरीश,
पुत्र श्री डी.एन. नन्जुदप्पा,
निवासी दुर्गा एस्टेट,
देवीहल्ली, कुंदार पोस्ट,
एल्लूर तालुक, जिला हसन।
33. मैसर्स बेस्ट कॉफी क्यूरिंग वर्क्स प्रा.लि.,
हसन और स्टेट बैंक ऑफ मैसूर,
हसन शाखा, हसन के अज्ञात कर्मचारी।

और किन्हीं अन्य लोक सेवकों अथवा व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध वर्ष 1998-2003 के दौरान 'वेयर हाउस रिमिट लोन' योजना के अंतर्गत साख-सुविधाएं प्राप्त करने के मामले में स्टेट बैंक ऑफ मैसूर, हसन

शाखा को 125 लाख रुपये का धोखा देने के लिए भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का अधिनियम सं. 45) की धारा 120-बी संपठित धारा 420, 468 और 471 तथा भ्रष्टाचार निवारण अधिनियम, 1988 (1988 का अधिनियम सं. 49) की धारा 13(2) संपठित धारा 13(1)(डी) के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों से संबंधित अथवा संसक्त तथा उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अथवा उन्हीं तथ्यों से उद्भूत किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तार सम्पूर्ण कर्नाटक राज्य पर करती है।

[सं 228/52/2004-ए.पी.डी.-II]

भास्कर खुल्बे, निदेशक

New Delhi the 16th July, 2004

S.O. 1724.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with Section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (Act No.25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of State Government of Karnataka, vide Notification No. HD 80 PCR 2004 dated 14th May 2004, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Karnataka for investigation of offences punishable under Section 120-B read with 420,468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act No. 45 of 1860) and under Section 13(2) read with 13(1)(d) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (Act No. 49 of 1988) against:—

- (1) Shri G.C Chandra Mohan,
Director,
M/s. Best Coffee Curing
Works Private Limited,
Hassan.
- (2) Smt. Geetha Chandrā Mohan,
Director,
M/s. Best Coffee Curing
Works Private Limited,
Hassan.
- (3) Shri V.L. Fernandes,
Director,
M/s. Best Coffee Curing
Works Private Limited,
Hassan.
- (4) Smt. Laura Fernandes,
Director,
M/s. Best Coffee Curing
Works Private Limited,
Hassan.
- (5) Shri S. Anil Subbaiah,
Manager, M/s. Best Coffee
Curing Works Private Limited,
Hassan.

- (6) Shri G. S. Shantaappa,
Manager (Finance),
M/s Best Coffee Curing Works
Private Limited, Hassan.
- (7) Shri Chandrachar
S/O Sri. Chennaveetrachar,
R/o Easwara Temple Street,
Hassan.
- (8) Shri K.K. Chengappa,
S/o Shri. K. Cariapa,
R/o Muthava Village,
Arabally post, Belur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (9) Shri H.S. Ramesh,
S/o Sri. Shivanna,
R/o Udayawar, Shakleshpur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (10) Shri H.M. Ramachandra,
S/o Sri H. R. Mallikarjunaiah,
R/o Behind Bus Stand,
Shakleshpur Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (11) Shri B.K. Giridhar,
S/o Sri. B.S. Kashiviswanath,
R/o Main Road, Kodlipet,
Somvarpet Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (12) H.B. Puttaswamy,
S/o Sri. Basappa,
R/o Doddahalli, Nidhata Post,
Shukwarsanthe, Somvarpet Taluk,
Coorg Dist.
- (13) Shri H. N. Gyaneshwara Rao,
S/o Sri. Narayan Rao,
R/o 5555/A, 2nd Cross,
Ravindra Nagar,
Hassan Dist.
- (14) Shri J.C. Vidya Kiran,
S/o Sri. Chandrasekhar R/o. Chagally,
Hanbal Post, Shakleshpur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (15) Shri M.T. Somsekar,
S/o Sri. Thimagowda,
R/o Rajendra Para
Ballpet Hobli Sakleshpur
Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (16) Shri B.K. Yatheesh,
S/o Sri. V.S. Kashiviswanathiah,
R/o Kodlipet Main, Somvarpet
Taluk, Kodagu Dist.
- (17) Shri A.P. Poviah,
S/o Sri. Poornacha,
R/o Rampura, Chickamagalur Taluka,
Chickamagalur Dist.
- (18) Shri G.R. Shantaappa,
S/o. Sri. Rajappa,
R/o Gopalapura Village,
Sanvarpet Taluk,
Kodagu Dist.
- (19) Shri C.H. Basappa,
S/o. Sri. C. Chennappa,
R/o Chennahalli, Alur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (20) Shri S.C. Apparna Gowda,
S/o. Sri. Chenna Gowda,
R/o Sreedarhalli, Arakal Gad Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (21) Shri D. Venkatesh,
S/o. Sri. Devigere,
R/o Devigere, Kander Post,
Alur Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (22) Shri K.S. Rajesh,
S/o. Sri. Shantappa,
R/o Kodlipet,
Somvarpet Taluk,
Kodagu Dist.
- (23) Shri B.H. Nagarajaiah,
S/o. Sri. B. Halappa,
R/o Yeslur,
Sakleshpur Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (24) Shri B.K. Rajakumar,
S/o. Sri. Krishnasekar,
R/o Sakrawar, Somvarpet,
Sakleshpur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (25) Shri B.K. Eashwar,
S/o. Sri. Kashiviswanath,
R/o Main Road,
Kodlipet, Kodagu Dist.
- (26) Shri A.R. Somasunder,
S/o. Sri. A.V. Rajappa, R/o Main Road,
Kodlipet, Kodagu Dist.
- (27) Shri K.A. Nateth,
S/o. Sri. Annaiah,
R/o Bahupet, Sakleshpur Taluk,
Hassan Dist.
- (28) Shri B.S. Manjunatha,
S/o. Sri. Subbarao,
R/o Gaddahalli,
Belur Taluk, Hassan Dist.
- (29) Shri K.C. Mahesh Kumar,
S/o Sri K.P. Chandrasekar,
R/o Kanthar, Palya Hobli,
Alur Taluk, Hassan District.

- (30) Shri H.N. Kumaraswaroop,
S/o Sri Late H.L. Nanjanadappa,
R/o Chickanayakarahalli Estate,
Hosaline Road, Hassan District.
- (31) Shri H.S. Mohan,
S/o Sri H.C. Mohan,
R/o Chickanayakarahalli Estate,
Hosaline Road, Hassan District.
- (32) Shri D.N. Harish,
S/o Sri. D.N. Nanjudappa,
R/o Durga Estate,
Devihalli, Kundar Post,
Alur Taluk, Hassan District.
- (33) M/s. Best Coffee Curing Works
Private Limited, Hassan,
and unknown officials of State Bank
of Mysore, Hassan Branch, Hassan.

for defrauding State Bank of Mysore, Hassan Branch to the extent of Rs. 125 lacs in the matter of availing credit facilities under the the scheme 'Ware-house Receipt Loans' during the year 1998-2003 and any other public servants or persons in relation to, or in connection with the said offences, and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction or arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/52/2004-AVD-II]

BHASKAR KHULBE, Director

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 15 जून, 2004

(आयकर)

का. आ. 1725 .—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 के खण्ड (23-ग) के उपखण्ड (iv) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार एतद्वारा "दूरण्ड फुटबाल टूर्नामेंट सोसाइटी, नई दिल्ली" को वर्ष 2000-2001 से 2002-2003 तक के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए उक्त उप खंड के प्रयोजनार्थ अनुमोदित करती है, अर्थात् :—

- (i) कर-निर्धारिती अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल अथवा अपनी आय का इस्तेमाल करने के लिए उसका संचयन पूर्णतया तथा अनन्यतया उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई है ;
- (ii) कर-निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (जेवर-जवाहिरात, फर्नीचर अथवा किसी अन्य वस्तु आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा ;

- (iii) यह आदेश किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगा, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक कि ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएं नहीं रखी जाती हों ;
- (iv) कर निर्धारिती आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष दाखिल करेगा ;
- (v) विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियाँ और परिसम्पत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जाएंगी।

[अधिसूचना सं. 157/2004/फ. सं. 196/3/2004—आई.टी.ए.-I]

आई. पी. एस. बिन्द्रा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 15th June, 2004

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1725 .—In exercise of powers conferred by clause (23) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies the "Durand Football Tournament Society, New Delhi" for the purpose of the said sub-clause for the assessment years 2000-2001 to 2002-2003 subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application, wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established ;
- (ii) the assessee will not invest or deposit its fund (other than voluntary contributions received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in any one or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of Section 11 ;
- (iii) this notification will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gains of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business ;
- (iv) the assessee will regularly file its return of income before the Income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of the Income-tax Act, 1961 ;
- (v) that in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organisation with similar objectives.

[Notification No. 157/2004/F. No. 196/3/2004-ITA-I]

I. P. S. BINDRA, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1726 .—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 29 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार, एतद्वारा, क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक (अधिकारियों एवं अन्य कर्मचारियों की नियुक्ति एवं पदोन्नति) नियम, 1998 में और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, नामतः :—

1. (1) इन नियमों को क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक (अधिकारियों एवं अन्य कर्मचारियों की नियुक्ति एवं पदोन्नति) (संशोधन) नियम, 2004 कहा जाएगा।
- (2) ये सरकारी राजपत्र में अपने प्रकाशन की तारीख से लागू होंगे।
2. क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक (अधिकारियों एवं अन्य कर्मचारियों की नियुक्ति एवं पदोन्नति) नियम, 1998 में :

टिप्पणी की तृतीय अनुसूची में मद 1(छ), 2(छ), 3(छ), 4(छ), 5(छ), 6(छ), एवं 7(छ) में प्रत्येक के नीचे लिखे गए शब्दों "बोर्ड नामित कर सकता है" के लिए शब्द "बोर्ड नामित करेंगे" प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[फा. सं. 3(4)/2000-आरआरबी]

जी. बी. सिंह, अवर सचिव

पाद टिप्पणी : (i) मूल नियम सरकारी राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में का. आ. 642(अ) दिनांक 29 जुलाई, 1998 के तहत प्रकाशित किए गए थे।

(ii) संशोधित नियम सरकारी राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में का. आ. 1091(अ) दिनांक 16 अक्टूबर, 2002 के तहत प्रकाशित किए गए थे।

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 13th July, 2004

S.O. 1726 .—In exercise of powers conferred by section 29 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby makes the following Rules further to amend the Regional Rural Banks (Appointment and Promotion of Officers and other Employees) Rules, 1998, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called as the Regional Rural Banks (Appointment and Promotion of Officers and other Employees) (Amendment) Rules, 2004.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Regional Rural Banks (Appointment and Promotions of Officers and other Employees) Rules, 1998, in the Third Schedule, in the Note, for the words "the Board may nominate" occurring below each of the items 1(g), 2(g), 3(g), 4(g), 5(g), 6(g) and 7(g), the words "the Board shall nominate" shall be substituted.

[F.No. 3(4)/2000-RRB]

G. B. SINGH, Under Secy.

Foot note : (i) The principal rules were published vide notification number S.O. 642(E) dated the 29th July, 1998 in the Official Gazette, Part II, Section 3 Sub-Section (ii).

(ii) The amendment rules were published vide S.O. 1091(E) dated 16th October, 2002 in the Official Gazette, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii).

(राजपत्र विभाग)

सेन्ट्रल इकॉनॉमिक इन्टेलीजेंस ब्यूरो

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1727 .—अतः संयुक्त सचिव, भारत सरकार जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत विशेष रूप से शक्ति प्रदान की गई है, ने उक्त उप-धारा के अधीन आदेश प्रारूप नं. 673/05/2004-सी.यू.एस. VIII, दिनांक 31-05-2004 को जारी किया और यह निर्देश दिया कि श्री अफजल फाजल दलाल, सुपुत्र श्री फाजल सचार दलाल, निवासी बी-803, शिल्परज अफार्टमेंट, अडाजन पाटिका, सूरत, गुजरात को निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और केन्द्रीय कारागार, सबरमती, गुजरात में अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ताकि उन्हें भविष्य में चीजों की तस्करी करने से रोका जा सके।

2. अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपा रखा है जिससे यह आदेश निष्पादित नहीं किया जा सकता।

3. अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति को यह निर्देश देती है कि वह शासकीय राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशित होने के 7 दिनों के भीतर पुलिस अधिका, सूरत के सम्मुख उपस्थित हो।

[फा. सं. 673/05/2004-सी.यू.एस. VIII]
एच. एस. कुंजरु, उपसचिव (विदेशी मुद्रा)

(Department of Revenue)

CENTRAL ECONOMIC INTELLIGENCE BUREAU

New Delhi, the 15th July, 2004

S.O. 1727 .—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Ex-

change and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued Order F. No. 673/05/2004-Cus. VIII dated 31-05-2004 under the said Sub-section directing that Shri Afzal Fazal Dalal S/o Shri Fazal Sattar Dalal, R/o B-803, Shilpraj Apartment, Adajan Patia, Surat, Gujarat be detained and kept in custody in the Central Jail, Sabarmati, Gujarat with a view to preventing him from smuggling goods in future.

2. Whereas the Central Government has reasons to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Surat within 7 days of the publication of this order in the Official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/05/2004-Cus. VIII]

N. M. KRISHNAN, Dy. Secy (COFE POSA):

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1728 .—अतः संयुक्त सचिव, भारत सरकार जिन्हें विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत विशेष रूप से शक्ति प्रदान की गई है, ने उक्त उप-धारा के अधीन आदेश फाइल सं. 673/11/2004-सी.यू.एस. VIII, दिनांक 17-06-2004 को जारी किया और यह निर्देश दिया कि श्री राकेश द्विवेदी, सुपुत्र स्वर्गीय श्री बंशीलाल द्विवेदी, निवासी न. 87, त्रिवेणी अपार्टमेंट, पीतमपुरा (पश्चिम), नई दिल्ली-110 034 को निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और केन्द्रीय कारागार, तिहाड़, नई दिल्ली में अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ताकि उन्हें भविष्य में चीजों की तस्करी करने से रोका जा सके।

2. अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या स्वयं को छिपा रखा है जिससे यह आदेश निष्पादित नहीं किया जा सकता।

3. अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति को यह निर्देश देती है कि वह शासकीय राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशित होने के 7 दिन के भीतर पुलिस आयुक्त, दिल्ली के सम्मुख उपस्थित हो।

[फ. सं. 673/11/2004-सी.यू.एस. VIII]

एन. एम. कृष्णन, उपसचिव (कोफेपोसा)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th July, 2004

S.O. 1728 .—Whereas the Joint Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Ex-

change and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued Order F. No. 673/11/2004-Cus. VIII dated 17-06-2004 under the said Sub-section directing that Shri Rakesh Divedi S/o Late Shri Bansilal Divedi, R/o No. 87, Triveni Apartments, Pitampura (West) New Delhi-110 034 be detained and kept in custody in the Central Jail, Tihar, New Delhi with a view to preventing him from smuggling goods in future.

2. Whereas the Central Government has reasons to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed.

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of Sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Delhi within 7 days of the publication of this order in the Official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/11/2004-Cus. VIII]

N. M. KRISHNAN, Dy. Secy (COFE POSA):

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1729 .—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के खंड (1) के अनुसरण में, एतद्वारा निर्देश देते हैं कि उनके नियंत्रण के अध्वधीन और आगामी आदेशों तक, निम्नलिखित प्राधिकारी अपने संबंधित संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों में सिगरेट और तम्बाकू उत्पाद (विज्ञापन का निषेध और व्यापार तथा वाणिज्य, उत्पादन, आपूर्ति और वितरण का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 2003 (2003 का 34) के अंतर्गत राज्य सरकार की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे तथा उसके कार्यों का निर्वाह करेंगे :—

क्रम सं.	संघ राज्य क्षेत्र का नाम	प्राधिकारी
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	अंडमान और निकोबार द्वीप समूह	उपराज्यपाल
2.	चंडीगढ़	प्रशासक
3.	दादरा और नगर हवेली तथा दमण एवं दीव	प्रशासक
4.	लक्षद्वीप	प्रशासक
5.	राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र दिल्ली	उपराज्यपाल
6.	पाण्डिचेरी	उपराज्यपाल

[फ. सं. पी-16011/1/2004-पी.एच.]

भवानी त्यागराजन, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE**(Department of Health)**

New Delhi, the 14th July, 2004

S.O. 1729 .—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that, subject to his control and until further orders, the following authorities in their respective Union Territories shall exercise the powers and discharge the functions of the State Government under the Cigarettes and Other Tobacco Products (Prohibition of Advertisement and Regulation of Trade and Commerce, Production, Supply and Distribution) Act, 2003 (34 of 2003) :—

Sl. No.	Name of Union Territory	Authority
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	Lt. Governor
2.	Chandigarh	Administrator
3.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu	Administrator
4.	Lakshadweep	Administrator
5.	National Capital Territory of Delhi	Lt. Governor
6.	Pondicherry	Lt. Governor

[F. No. P-16011/1/2004-PH]

BHAVANI THYAGARAJAN, Jt. Secy.

कृषि मंत्रालय

(कृषि अनुसंधान एवं शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1730 .—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कृषि मंत्रालय, कृषि अनुसंधान एवं शिक्षा विभाग, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियमावली 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद् (आई सी ए आर) के निम्नलिखित निदेशालय/संस्थानों/केन्द्रों में हिन्दी का कार्यसमर्थक ज्ञान रखने वाले कर्मचारियों की संख्या 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक हो जाने के फलस्वरूप उन्हें एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है :—

1. केन्द्रीय कपास अनुसंधान संस्थान, नागपुर
2. तिलहन अनुसंधान निदेशालय, हैदराबाद
3. केन्द्रीय भैंस अनुसंधान संस्थान का क्षेत्रीय केन्द्र, नाभा, पंजाब
4. राष्ट्रीय मखाना अनुसंधान केन्द्र, दरभंगा, बिहार
5. भारतीय बागवानी अनुसंधान संस्थान, बेंगलूर।

[सं. 13-2/2002-हिन्दी]

देवेन्द्र कुमार छतवाल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE**(Department of Agricultural Research & Education)**

New Delhi, the 12th July, 2004

S.O. 1730 .—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (use for official purpose of the Union) Rules 1976, the Central Government, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Research & Education hereby notifies the following Directorate/Institutes/Centres of ICAR where the percentage of Hindi knowing staff has gone above 80% :—

1. Central Institute for Cotton Research, Nagpur
2. Directorate of Oilseeds Research, Hyderabad
3. Central Institute for Buffalo Research, Regional Centre, Nabha, Punjab.
4. National Research Centre for Makhana, Darbhanga, Bihar.
5. Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Bangalore.

[F. No. 13-2/2002-Hindi]

D. K. CHHATWAL, Under Secy.

उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1731 .—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये मानक(को) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संशोधित भारतीय सं. मानक की संख्या और वर्ष	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. आईएस 283:1976	संशोधन सं. 4 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003
2. आईएस 653:1992	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 2003	01-04-2004
3. आईएस 903:1993	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	09-01-2004
4. आईएस 1367 (भाग 9/खंड 1) : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 2003	31-10-2003
5. आईएस 1367 (भाग 9/खंड 2) : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 2003	31-10-2003

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6.	आईएस 1536:2001	संशोधन सं. 2 दिसम्बर 2003	05-01-2004	27.	आईएस 8500:1991	संशोधन सं. 5 दिसम्बर 2003	07-01-2004
7.	आईएस 1660 (भाग 1):1982	संशोधन सं. 6 सितम्बर 2003	31-03-2004	28.	आईएस 9449 (भाग 2):1985	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003
8.	आईएस 1652:1991	संशोधन सं. 4 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003	29.	आईएस 9449 (भाग 3):1985	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003
9.	आईएस 1729:2002	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 2003	17-12-2003	30.	आईएस 10204:2001	संशोधन सं. 2 दिसम्बर 2003	01-04-2004
10.	आईएस 1729:2002	संशोधन सं. 2 दिसम्बर 2003	05-01-2004	31.	आईएस 10658:1999	संशोधन सं. 3 सितम्बर 2003	07-01-2004
11.	आईएस 1879:1987	संशोधन सं. 7 नवम्बर 2003	07-01-2004	32.	आईएस 11542 (भाग 1):1985	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003
12.	आईएस 1977:1996	संशोधन सं. 3 जुलाई 2003	11-08-2003	33.	आईएस 11542 (भाग 2):1985	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003
13.	आईएस 2062:1999	संशोधन सं. 4 दिसम्बर 2003	07-01-2004	34.	आईएस 11852 (भाग 2):2001	संशोधन सं. 1 नवम्बर 2003	30-11-2003
14.	आईएस 2112:2003	संशोधन सं. 2 जनवरी 2004	31-01-2004	35.	आईएस 11852 (भाग 3):2001	संशोधन सं. 1 नवम्बर 2003	30-11-2003
15.	आईएस 2148:1981	संशोधन सं. 6 सितम्बर 2003	10-11-2003	36.	आईएस 11852 (भाग 8):2001	संशोधन सं. 1 नवम्बर 2003	30-11-2003
16.	आईएस 2171:1999	संशोधन सं. 3 सितम्बर 2003	16-01-2004	37.	आईएस 12884:1990	संशोधन सं. 2 नवम्बर 2003	30-11-2003
17.	आईएस 2596:1980	संशोधन सं. 3 जुलाई 2003	01-04-2004	38.	आईएस 13346:1992	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003
18.	आईएस 2787:1986	संशोधन सं. 3 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003	39.	आईएस 13369:1992	संशोधन सं. 1 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003
19.	आईएस 2878:1986	संशोधन सं. 5 सितम्बर 2003	01-04-2004	40.	आईएस 13385:1992	संशोधन सं. 3 सितम्बर 2003	07-01-2004
20.	आईएस 3515:1966	संशोधन सं. 1 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003	41.	आईएस 13408 (भाग 1):1992	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्तूबर 2003	31-10-2003
21.	आईएस 3589:2001	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्तूबर 2003	07-01-2004	42.	आईएस 13514:1992	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	30-09-2003
22.	आईएस 3989:1984	संशोधन सं. 4 अक्तूबर 2003	07-01-2004	43.	आईएस 13849:1993	संशोधन सं. 4 सितम्बर 2003	01-04-2004
23.	आईएस 4984:1995	संशोधन सं. 3 सितम्बर 2003	07-01-2004	44.	आईएस 14333:1996	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	07-01-2004
24.	आईएस 5244:1991	संशोधन सं. 3 सितम्बर 2003	13-01-2004	45.	आईएस 14609:1999	संशोधन सं. 1 फरवरी 2003	12-05-2003
25.	आईएस 6381:1972	संशोधन सं. 4 सितम्बर 2003	30-01-2004	46.	आईएस 14609:1999	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	01-03-2004
26.	आईएस 7372:1995	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 2003	30-01-2004	47.	आईएस 14664:1999	संशोधन सं. 1 दिसम्बर 2003	31-12-2003

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
48. आईएस 14768 :	संशोधन सं. 1	30-11-2003	
(भाग 1) : 2003	नवम्बर 2003		
49. आईएस 14845: 2000	संशोधन सं. 1	07-01-2004	
	सितम्बर 2003		
50. आईएस 15111	संशोधन सं. 1	30-11-2003	
(भाग 1): 2002	नवम्बर 2003		
51. आईएस 15111	संशोधन सं. 1	30-11-2003	
(भाग 2): 2002	नवम्बर 2003		
52. आईएस 15244:2002	संशोधन सं. 1	30-11-2003	
	नवम्बर 2003		
53. आईएस 15245:2003	संशोधन सं. 1	31-10-2003	
	अक्टूबर 2003		

इन संशोधनों की प्रतियाँ भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो मानक भवन 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों, नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के०प्र०वि० -4/13 : 5]

एस. के. चौधरी, उपमहानिदेशक (मुहर)

**MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD
AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION**

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 12th July, 2004

S.O. 1731 .—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendments to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. of Year of the Indian Standards	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS:283:1976	Amendment No. 4 September 2003	30-09-2003
2.	IS:653:1992	Amendment No. 1 July 2003	01-04-2004
3.	IS:903:1993	Amendment No. 2 September 2003A	09-01-2004

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.	IS:1367(Pt 9/ Sec. 1):1993	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
5.	IS:1367(Pt 9/ Sec. 2):1993	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
6.	IS:1536:2001	Amendment No. 2 December 2003	05-01-2004
7.	IS:1660 (Part 1): 1982	Amendment No. 6 September 2003	31-03-2004
8.	IS:1652:1991	Amendment No. 4 September 2003	30-09-2003
9.	IS:1729:2002	Amendment No. 1 August 2003	17-12-2003
10.	IS:1729:2002	Amendment No. 2 December 2003	05-01-2004
11.	IS:1879:1987	Amendment No. 7 November 2003	07-01-2004
12.	IS:1977:1996	Amendment No. 3 July 2003	11-08-2004
13.	IS:2062:1999	Amendment No. 4 December 2003	07-01-2004
14.	IS:2112:2003	Amendment No. 2 January 2004	31-01-2004
15.	IS:2148:1981	Amendment No. 6 September 2003	10-11-2003
16.	IS:2171:1999	Amendment No. 3 September 2003	16-01-2004
17.	IS:2596:1980	Amendment No. 3 July 2003	01-04-2004
18.	IS:2787:1986	Amendment No. 3 October 2003	31-10-2003
19.	IS:2878:1986	Amendment No. 5 September 2003	01-04-2004
20.	IS:3515:1966	Amendment No. 1 September 2003	30-09-2003
21.	IS:3589:2001	Amendment No. 2 October 2003	07-01-2004
22.	IS:3989:1984	Amendment No. 4 October 2003	07-01-2004
23.	4984:1995	Amendment No. 3 September 2003	07-01-2004
24.	5244:1991	Amendment No. 3 September 2003	12-01-2004
25.	6381:1972	Amendment No. 4 September 2003	30-01-2004
26.	7372:1995	Amendment No. 2 September 2003	30-10-2004
27.	IS:8500:1991	Amendment No. 5 December 2003	07-01-2004

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
28.	IS : 9449(Pt 2): 1985	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
29.	IS : 9449 (Pt 3): 1985	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
30.	IS : 10204:2001	Amendment No. 2 December 2003	01-04-2004
31.	IS : 10658:1999	Amendment No. 3 September 2003	07-01-2004
32.	IS : 11542 (Pt 1): 1985	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
33.	IS : 11542 (Pt 2): 1985	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
34.	IS : 11852 (Pt 2): 2001	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
35.	IS : 11852 (Pt 3): 2001	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
36.	IS : 11852 (Pt 8): 2001	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
37.	IS : 12884 : 1990	Amendment No. 2 November 2003	30-11-2003
38.	IS : 13346:1992	Amendment No. 2 September 2003	30-09-2003
39.	IS : 13369:1992	Amendment No. 1 September 2003	30-09-2003
40.	IS : 13385:1992	Amendment No. 3 September	07-01-2004
41.	IS : 13408 (Pt 1): 1992	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003
42.	IS : 13514: 1992	Amendment No. 2 September 2003	30-09-2003
43.	IS : 13849:1993	Amendment No. 4 September 2003	01-04-2004
44.	IS : 14333:1993	Amendment No. 2 September 2003	07-01-2004
45.	IS : 14609:1999	Amendment No. 1 February 2003	13-05-2003
46.	IS : 14609:1999	Amendment No. 2 September 2003	01-03-2004
47.	IS : 14664:1999	Amendment No. 1 December 2003	31-12-2003
48.	IS : 14768 (Pt 1): 2003	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
49.	IS : 14845:2000	Amendment No. 1 September 2003	07-01-2004
50.	IS : 15111(Pt 1): 2002	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
51.	IS : 15111 (Pt 2): 2002	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
52.	IS : 15244:2002	Amendment No. 1 November 2003	30-11-2003
53.	IS : 15245:2003	Amendment No. 1 October 2003	31-10-2003

Copy of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Office : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD-IV/13 : 5]

S. K. CHAUDHURI, Dy. Director General (Marks)

कोयला और खान मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1732 .—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन इस्पात, खान और कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 3403, तारीख 8 जुलाई, 1985 जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग, II खंड 3(ii), तारीख 20 जुलाई, 1985 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, द्वारा उन बातों के सिवाय अधिकृत करते हुए, जिन्हें ऐसे अधिकृत से पहले किया गया है या किए जाने को लोप किया गया है, नीचे सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी की रैंक के समतुल्य अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और उक्त अधिकारी उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों की बाबत अपनी-अपनी अधिकारिताओं की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और उन पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेंगे, अर्थात् :—

सारणी

क्रम	अधिकारी का पद नाम	सरकारी स्थानों के प्रवर्ग
संख्या		
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	महाप्रबंधक (सम्पदा) भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर- बी.सी.सी.एल. टाउनशिप, कोयला नगर, धनबाद-826005	झारखंड और पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान जो कोयला नगर, कोल बोर्ड कोलोनी, जगजीवन नगर के नाम से ज्ञात हैं।

[illegible]

(1)	(2)	(3)
17.	क्षेत्र कार्मिक प्रबंधक, कुसुंडा क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-कुस्तोर, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828117	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के लोदना क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
18.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), कुसुंडा क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-कुस्तोर, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828117	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के लोदना क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
19.	क्षेत्र कार्मिक प्रबंधक बस्ताकोला क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड डाकघर-झरिया, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828111	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के सुदामडीह क्षेत्र और पूर्वी झरिया क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
20.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), वास्ताकोला क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-झरिया, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828111	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के सुदामडीह क्षेत्र और पूर्वी झरिया क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
21.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), लोदना क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-खास जीनागोरा, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828115	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के बस्ताकोला क्षेत्र और रोपवेज खंड के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
22.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), लोदना क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-खास जीनागोरा, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828115	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के बस्ताकोला क्षेत्र और रोपवेज खंड के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
23.	क्षेत्र कार्मिक प्रबंधक, पूर्वी झरिया क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-भोवरा, जिला-धनबाद, पिन-828301	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के कुस्तोरा क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
24.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), पूर्वी झरिया क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-भोवरा, जिला-धनबाद पिन-828301	झारखण्ड राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के कुस्तोरा क्षेत्र के स्थान या उनके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।
25.	क्षेत्र कार्मिक प्रबंधक, चंच विक्टोरिया क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-बराकर, जिला बर्धवान, पिन-713324	झारखंड और पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के चंच विक्टोरिया क्षेत्र के स्थान या उसके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।

(1)	(2)	(3)
26.	क्षेत्र प्रबंधक, (योजना), चंच विक्टोरिया क्षेत्र, भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड, डाकघर-बराकर, जिला-बर्धवान, पिन-713324	झारखंड और पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य में भारत कोकिंग कोल लिमिटेड के चंच विक्टोरिया क्षेत्र के स्थान या उसके द्वारा या उनकी ओर से पट्टे पर लिए गए स्थान।

[फा. सं. 43022/2/2004-पी.आर.आई.डब्ल्यू.]

संजय बहादुर, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COAL AND MINES

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 14th July, 2004

S.O. 1732 .—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupation) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the then Ministry of Steel, Mines and Coal published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated the 20th July, 1985 vide S.O. No. 3403 dated the 8th July, 1985, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, Central Government hereby appoints the Officers mentioned in column (2) of the Table below, being Officers equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officers of the Government to be Estate Officers for the purposes of the said Act and the said officers shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the Estate Officers, by or under the said Act within the local limits of their respective jurisdictions in respect of public premises specified in column (3) of the said Table, namely:—

TABLE

S. No.	Designation of Officer	Categories of Public Premises
1	2	3
1.	General Manager (Estate) Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. Post Office—BCCL Township, Koyla Nagar, Dhanbad-826005.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bharat Coking Coal Limited in the State of Jharkhand and West Bengal known as Koyla Nagar, Coal Board Colony, Jagjiwan Nagar.
2.	Deputy Chief Manager (L&R), Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. Post Office - BCCL Township, Koyla Nagar, Dhanbad-826005.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bharat Coking Coal Limited in the State of Jharkhand and West Bengal known as Madhuban Washery, EW Zone, Dugdha Washery, CCWO Colony & Bhuli Town Admn. Bhuli.

1	2	3	1	2	3
3. Area Personnel Manager, Barora Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Nawagarh, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828306.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Western Jharia Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		11. Area Personnel Manager, Sijua Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sijua Area, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828121.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Post Office Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
4. Area Manager (Planning), Barora Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Nawagarh, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828306.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Western Jharia Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		12. Area Manager (Planning), Sijua Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sijua Area, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828121.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of P.O. Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
5. Area Personnel Manager, Western Jharia Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Moonidih, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828129.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Govendpur Area and Block-II, Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		13. Area Personnel Manager, Kusunda Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kusunda, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828116.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Katras Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
6. Area Manager (Planning), Western Jharia Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Moonidih, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828129.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Govendpur Area and Block-II Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		14. Area Manager (Planning), Kusunda Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kusunda, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828116.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Katras Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
7. Area Personnel Manager, Govendpur Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sonardih, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828125.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Barora Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		15. Area Personnel Manager, P.B. Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kusunda, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828116.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Sijua Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
8. Area Manager (Planning), Govendpur Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sonardih, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828125.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Barora Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		16. Area Manager (Planning), P.B. Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kusunda, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828116.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Sijua Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
9. Area Personnel Manager, Katras Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sirjua, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828121.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Kusuaa Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		17. Area Personnel Manager, Kusunda Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kustore, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828117.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Lodna Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
10. Area Manager (Planning), Katras Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Sijua, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828121.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Kusuaa Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.		18. Area Manager (Planning), Kusunda Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Kustore, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828117.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Lodna Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
			19. Area Personnel Manager, Bastacolla Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Jharia, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828111.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Eastern Jharia Area and Sudamdih Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	

1	2	3
20. Area Manager (Planning), Bastacolla Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Jharia, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828111.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Eastern Jharia Area and Sudamdih Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
21. Area Personnel Manager, Lodna Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Khas Jeenagora, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828115.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bastacolla Area and Ropeways Divn. of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
22. Area Manager (Planning), Lodna Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Khas Jeenagora, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828115.	Premises Belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Bastacolla Area and Ropeways Divn. of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
23. Area Personnel Manager, Eastern Jharia Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Bhowra, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828301.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Kustora Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
24. Area Manager (Planning), Eastern Jharia Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Bhowra, District-Dhanbad, Pin-828301.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Kustora Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand.	
25. Area Personnel Manager, Chanch Victoria Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Barakar, District-Burdwan, Pin-713324.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Chanch Victoria Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand and West Bengal.	
26. Area Manager (Planning), Chanch Victoria Area, Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office-Barakar, District-Burdwan, Pin-713324.	Premises belonging to or taken on lease by or on behalf of Chanch Victoria Area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, in the State of Jharkhand and West Bengal.	

जल संसाधन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 2004

क्र. आ. 1733 .—सहभागिता सिंचाई प्रबंधन (जिसे आगे इंडिया एन पी आई एम कहा जायेगा), जोकि सोसाइटीज रजिस्ट्रेशन एक्ट, 1860 के अंतर्गत दिल्ली में पंजीकृत एक सोसाइटी है, के संबंध में भारतीय नेटवर्क के संगम ज्ञापन और नियम एवं विनियम के नियम 9.1 के संबंध में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार ने दिनांक 14-2-2004 को भारत के राजपत्र में एस.ओ. सं. 339 के रूप में प्रकाशित दिनांक 24 दिसम्बर, 2003 की अधिसूचना सं. 10/9/2000-सीएडी के द्वारा जारी इसके निदेशों में आंशिक संशोधन करते हुए निम्नलिखित निदेश दिए हैं :—

- (vii) इंडिया एन पी आई एम के संगम ज्ञापन और नियम एवं विनियम के नियम 10.4.2 के संबंध में नवचयनित शासी निकाय इंडिया एन पी आई एम के अध्यक्ष का पदभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए उक्त सोसाइटी के नये अध्यक्ष का चुनाव कर सकती है।
- (viii) इंडिया एन पी आई एम के निर्वाचित अध्यक्ष द्वारा पदभार ग्रहण कर लिए जाने के उपरांत आयुक्त (पी पी), जल संसाधन मंत्रालय, इंडिया एन पी आई एम के पदेन अध्यक्ष की सेवा स्वतः समाप्त हो जाएगी।
- (ix) इंडिया एन पी आई एम के निर्वाचित अध्यक्ष द्वारा पदभार ग्रहण कर लेने के तुरंत बाद आयुक्त (पी पी), जल संसाधन मंत्रालय द्वारा प्रशासन और परिसंपत्तियां इंडिया एन पी आई एम को सौंप दी जाएगी, जो उपरोक्त को सारी चीजों के बारे में भी उचित ढंग से सूचित करेंगे जिसमें वित्तीय संस्थाएं शामिल हैं जहां पर सोसाइटी के लेखे का रखरखाव हो रहा है।
- (x) नये अध्यक्ष के चुनाव के उपरांत, इंडिया एन पी आई एम के प्रेक्षक के रूप में वरिष्ठतम वरिष्ठ संयुक्त आयुक्त (सीएडी) के नामांकन के लिए संगम ज्ञापन और नियम और विनियम में प्रावधान करने के लिए शासी निकाय की बैठक/आम बैठक बुलाई जा सकती है जोकि प्रत्येक शासी निकाय की बैठक तथा आम बैठक में भाग लेंगे और जल संसाधन मंत्रालय में इंडिया एन पी आई एम के विषय वस्तु प्रभाग को अपनी रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत करेंगे। जब तक उपरोक्त कार्य पूरा नहीं हो जाता और इंडिया एन पी आई एम में कोई नये नियमित प्रेक्षक की नियुक्ति नहीं हो जाती तब तक आयुक्त (पी पी), जल संसाधन मंत्रालय, सोसाइटी के प्रेक्षक के रूप में कार्य करते रहेंगे।
- (xi) निर्वाचित अध्यक्ष, जांच अधिकारी की उन सिफारिशों जिन्हें भारत सरकार द्वारा स्वीकृति मिल चुकी है और इंडिया एन पी आई एम के पदेन अध्यक्ष के रूप में रहकर आयुक्त (पी पी), जल संसाधन मंत्रालय द्वारा यदि कोई कार्रवाई नहीं की गई है, पर यथोक्ति कार्रवाई करेंगे।

[F. No. 43022/2/2004-PRIW]
SANJAY BAHADUR, Director

- (xii) निर्वाचित अध्यक्ष सोसाइटियों के रजिस्ट्रार को भारत सरकार के उपरोक्त निदेशों के बारे में यथोचित रूप से सूचित करेंगे। सोसाइटियों/शासी निकाय के रजिस्ट्रार से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् इंडिया एन पी आई एम के निर्वाचित अध्यक्ष, यदि आवश्यक हुआ, तो शासी निकाय के 9वें सदस्य की नियुक्ति के संबंध में निर्णय ले सकते हैं।

उपरोक्त निदेश तत्काल प्रभाव से लागू होंगे।

[फ. सं. 10/6/2000-कमान क्षेत्र विकास]

सुषमा सिंह, अपर सचिव

MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES

New Delhi, the 12th July, 2004

S.O. 1733.—In exercise of the powers conferred in terms of Rule 9.1 of the Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulations of Indian Network on Participatory Irrigation Management (hereinafter referred as India NPIM), a society registered in Delhi under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, the Government of India in partial modification of its directions issued *vide* Notification No. 10/9/2003-Vig. dated 24th December, 2003 published as No. S.O. No 339 in the Gazette of India dated 14-2-2004, makes the following directives:—

- (i) In terms of Rule 10.4.2 of the Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulations of India NPIM, the newly elected Governing Body may elect a new President of the aforesaid Society for a period of two years w.e.f. the date he takes over the charge of President of Indian NPIM.
- (ii) On taking over the charge by the elected President of India NPIM, the Commissioner (PP), Ministry of Water Resources will automatically cease to be the *ex-officio* President of India NPIM.
- (iii) Soon after taking over the charge by the elected President of India NPIM, all the administration and assets will be transferred to India NPIM by the Commissioner (PP), Ministry of Water Resources, who will also appropriately intimate the above to all concerned including the financial institutions where the accounts of the society are being held.
- (iv) After the election of the new President, a Governing Body meeting / General Body meeting may be convened for inserting a provision in the Memorandum of Association and Rules and Regulation of India NPIM for the nomination of senior-most Senior Joint Commissioner (CAD), Ministry of Water Resources as the Observer of India NPIM, who will attend each and every Governing Body meeting and General Body meeting and submit his report to the Subject Matter Division of India NPIM in the Ministry of

Water Resources. Till the above action is completed and a new regular Observer is appointed in India NPIM, the Commissioner (PP), Ministry of Water Resources will function as the Observer of the Society.

- (v) The elected President will take appropriate action, if not already taken by the Commissioner (PP), Ministry of Water Resources in his capacity as the *ex-officio* President of India NPIM, on the recommendations of the enquiry officer, which has been accepted by the Government of India.
- (vi) The elected President will appropriately communicate the above directives of the Government of India to the Registrar of Societies. The decision regarding appointment of the 9th member of the Governing Body, may also be taken by the elected President of India NPIM, after consulting the Registrar of Societies / Governing Body and General Body, if necessary.

The above directives shall come into force with immediate effect.

[F.No. 10/6/2000-CAD]

SUSHMA SINGH, Add. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1734.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन्स (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी और भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 612 दिनांक 10-03-04 द्वारा उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में सहारनपुर से नजीबाबाद तक इण्डियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पेट्रोलियम उत्पादों के परिवहन हेतु उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी;

और उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को दिनांक 31-3-2004 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थीं;

और, सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि के उपयोग का अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाता है;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि के उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर इण्डियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा।

अनुसूची

तहसील : नजीबाबाद जिला:बिजनौर राज्य: उत्तर प्रदेश				
क्षेत्रफल				
गांव	खसरा नं०	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5
शरीफपुर बागर विला	31	0	00	60
एहतमाली	42	0	00	21
सादुल्लानगर	19	0	01	00
सौफतपुर	268	0	18	10
	270	0	00	21
	272	0	00	96
	363	0	26	99
नूरामपुर	48	0	01	00
हरेवली	70	0	06	00
सिकरोड़ा	49	0	00	30
मुस्सेपुर	182	0	00	30
	183	0	00	10
	184	0	00	10
किशोरपुर एहतमाली	423	0	01	25
राहुखेड़ी कौरा	112	0	02	68

[संख्या-आर-25011/27/2002-ओ आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 14th July, 2004

S.O. 1734.—Whereas by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Published in the Gazette of India vide number S.O. 612 dated 10-3-2004; issued under Sub section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the Right of User in the Land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the

transportation of Petroleum products from Saharanpur to Najibabad in the State of Uttar Pradesh by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And whereas, copies of the said gazette notification were made available to the public on 31-3-2004;

And, whereas, the Competent Authority in pursuance of Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, has submitted his report to the Central Government:

And, whereas, the Central Government after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is acquired.

And, further in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (4) of Section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil:Najibabad	District:Bijnor	State:Uttar Pradesh		
Village	Khasra No.	Hectare	Are	Centi are
1	2	3	4	5
Sharifpur Bangar	31	0	00	60
Bila Ahtmal	42	0	00	21
Sadullanagar	19	0	01	00
Saufatpur	268	0	18	10
	270	0	00	21
	272	0	00	96
	363	0	26	99
Noorampur	48	0	01	00
Harevali	70	0	06	00
Sikroda	49	0	00	30
Mussepur	182	0	00	30
	183	0	00	10
	184	0	00	10
Kishorpur Ahtmal	423	0	01	25
Rahu Kheri Kaura	112	0	02	68

[No. R-25011/27/2002-OR-1]

RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1733— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 468 दिनांक 23.02.2004 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट राजस्थान राज्य की तहसील बसीराबाद, जिला अजमेर, की भूमि में, सलाया-मथुरा पाइपलाइन प्रणाली परियोजना के विरमगाम-चाकसू, चाकसू-पानीपत और चाकसू-मथुरा सेक्शनों के संवर्धन के कियान्वयन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में विरमगाम से राजस्थान राज्य में चाकसू से होकर हरियाणा राज्य में पानीपत तक अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के लिए अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को दिनांक 15/03/2004 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी .;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए सभी विल्लंगों से मुक्त इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : नसीराबाद		जिला : अजमेर	राज्य : राजस्थान		
गाँव का नाम	खसरा सं.	क्षेत्रफल			वर्ग मीटर
		हेक्टेयर	एयर		
1	2	3	4		5
सनोद	3510	0	01		90

[फा. सं. आर-25011/39/2001-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1735.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 468 dated 23.02.2004 issued under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962). (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land in Tehsil : Nasirabad, District : Ajmer in Rajasthan State, specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Viramgam in the State of Gujarat to Panipat in the State of Haryana via Chaksu in the State of Rajasthan by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the Augmentation of Viramgam - Chaksu, Chaksu - Panipat & Chaksu - Mathura sections of Salaya - Mathura Pipeline System Project ;

And whereas, copy of the said notification was made available to the general public on 15/03/2004

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act submitted his report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government, after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vests from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : NASIRABAD		District : AJMER		State : RAJASTHAN	
Name of the Village	Khasara No.	Area			
		Hectare	Are	Sq. mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	
SANOD	3510	0	01	90	

[No. R-25011/39/2001-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1736.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी चेन्नई - तिरुच्चि-मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 4/2, आरोकियासामी स्ट्रीट, क्राफ़ोर्ड कालोनी, तिरुचिरापल्ली - 620012 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : आत्तूर

जिला : सेलम

राज्य : तमिलनाडु

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 98 पेरियेरी	30	3	0	23	10
	29	1	0	00	40
	38	1	0	16	53
	38	4	0	02	36
	38	2	0	08	03
	39	1	0	31	30
	44	4	0	22	04
	45	2ब	0	04	70
	193	3	0	06	80
	193	4अ	0	03	80
	193	1अ2	0	16	18
	193	1क	0	06	46
	53	2ड	0	03	21
	54	1	0	08	80
	54	3	0	20	67
	54	2अ	0	00	40
	56	2अ	0	18	11
	57	2ब	0	03	68
	57	2अ	0	21	80
	57	3अ	0	03	65
	422	3	0	23	36
	58	2	0	26	16
	115	1	0	16	80
	113	2ब	0	22	60
	114	1	0	00	40
	109	4ब	0	36	84
	107	2ब	0	16	52
	106	2ब	0	34	04
	103	8अ	0	12	47
	103	7	0	00	40
	103	5अ	0	14	24

1	2	3	4	5	6
	103	9अ	0	02	09
	103	5ब	0	02	56
	103	1अ	0	01	12
	103	1ब	0	05	22
	102	2	0	06	04
	102	1	0	00	40
	124	1ब	0	08	01
	124	1क	0	10	76
	124	1इ	0	00	40
	124	1ड	0	09	11
	124	1एफ	0	02	27
	131	8ब	0	06	45
	131	8अ	0	05	78
	130	7	0	00	40
	130	2ब	0	03	82
	131	19	0	02	97
	131	4ब	0	00	40
	130	2अ	0	11	12
	130	1	0	10	03
	134	6	0	06	57
	133	7	0	00	40
	134	5	0	19	15
	134	1	0	09	86
नं. 97 नत्तककै	108	7	0	09	72
	108	6	0	07	52
	108	4अ	0	07	38
	108	3	0	07	01
	108	2ब	0	02	96
	108	2अ	0	02	24
	108	1	0	07	21
	97	3ब	0	05	18
	97	3अ	0	06	37
	97	4	0	09	51
	97	5	0	08	92
	96	1अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	96	10	0	00	40
	96	11	0	00	40
	95	15अ2	0	03	71
	95	15अ3	0	06	54
	95	15अ4	0	05	33
नं. 94 त्यागनूर	32	6ब	0	07	69
	32	6क	0	00	71
	34	4	0	00	60
	34	3	0	12	12
	36	2	0	00	40
	37	10	0	02	29
	37	9	0	03	78
	37	8	0	03	83
	37	7	0	03	79
	37	6	0	03	65
	37	4	0	00	40
	37	5	0	02	60
	37	11	0	00	40
	37	12	0	03	72
	37	13	0	01	67
	37	14	0	00	40
	58	8ब	0	00	40
	58	6	0	06	88
	58	5ब	0	08	13
	58	5अ	0	06	23
	58	2	0	03	23
	29	2ब	0	11	10
	29	2अ	0	18	77
	7	7	0	09	53
	7	6	0	09	60
	7	5	0	13	41
	7	2ब	0	00	44
	13	1	0	04	70
	11	3अ2	0	14	70
	11	3अ1	0	11	22

1	2	3	4	5	6
	11	2अ	0	09	75
	11	1अ	0	16	90
	15	1	0	00	40
	10	1अ	0	00	93
	10	7ब2	0	11	55
	10	7ब1	0	01	01
	10	1क2	0	04	17
	10	1क1	0	02	88
	10	6ब	0	06	59
	10	2ब2	0	00	40
	10	2ब1	0	04	38
	10	5	0	00	75
	16	1अ	0	05	48
	59	1	0	02	48
नं. 95 मुम्मुडि	111	15	0	10	21
	111	13	0	07	27
	111	11	0	05	86
	111	9	0	01	35
	112	1	0	09	45
	110	3	0	30	15
	109	4	0	03	06
	108	1अ	0	09	50
	108	1ब	0	20	79
	107	8	0	10	08
	107	7	0	11	40
	117	5	0	19	61
	117	4ब	0	11	67
	117	4अ	0	09	33
	117	3	0	05	43
	117	7	0	08	75
	143	5	0	07	95
	73	2	0	14	27
	73	1	0	20	66
	67	4	0	24	86
	67	3	0	03	97

1	2	3	4	5	6
	67	1	0	22	71
	139	3	0	01	83
	135	1	0	02	15
	136	4	0	35	57
	146	3	0	11	23
	147	3	0	26	04
	148	5	0	11	39
	148	6	0	12	78
	149	4	0	17	93
	150	3	0	00	40
	150	2	0	04	97
नं . 86 देवियाकुरिच्चि	187	3ड	0	10	42
	187	3क	0	01	21
	187	3ब	0	10	60
	187	3अ	0	05	45
	187	2	0	04	11
	187	1	0	07	37
	190	4	0	06	48
	190	7	0	05	51
	190	2	0	10	06
	190	1ब	0	05	18
	190	1अ	0	02	16
	190	5	0	00	91
	191	13	0	11	97
	191	6	0	03	78
	191	4	0	04	18
	191	1	0	02	06
	191	3	0	00	40
	191	2	0	05	81
	181	8	0	14	55
	180	1	0	01	27
	179	4	0	01	91
	179	2अ	0	02	87
	179	2ब	0	04	78

1	2	3	4	5	6
	179	5	0	08	00
	178	6	0	16	03
	178	3	0	08	66
	174	1	0	01	64
	175	4	0	01	05
	175	5	0	06	98
	175	6	0	06	62
	175	7	0	12	30
	176	7	0	18	26
	160	8	0	09	72
	160	11	0	01	99
	160	10	0	01	92
	160	7	0	07	39
	160	6	0	06	20
	161	4	0	00	66
	161	7	0	05	99
	161	8	0	07	16
	161	2	0	04	60
	151	14	0	03	80
	151	13	0	07	96
	151	4	0	13	83
	150	33अ	0	15	63
	142		0	21	05
	143	1क	0	00	40
	143	1ब	0	00	40
	143	1अ	0	14	77
	141	2ब	0	10	82
	141	2अ	0	01	94
	144	1	0	02	15
	140	33अ	0	07	83
	138	43अ	0	08	30
	138	5	0	14	46
	137	1ब	0	19	77
	137	1अ	0	06	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	136	5	0	12	24
	136	4	0	08	92
	136	3	0	06	95
	136	2	0	00	40
	135	1	0	10	80
	134	2	0	10	05
	134	1	0	16	30
	134	3	0	04	04
	133	3	0	18	36
	133	2	0	08	87
नं. 87 वडकुमरै	48	5	0	01	27
	48	4	0	02	08
	48	3	0	03	40
	48	2	0	03	21
	48	1	0	02	95
	47	12	0	03	34
	47	11	0	02	72
	47	10	0	06	19
	47	3	0	02	27
	47	2	0	04	67
	5	2	0	11	26
	5	3	0	11	65
	5	7	0	00	40
	5	4	0	22	21
	5	5	0	00	54
	9	4	0	10	10
	9	5	0	00	40
	9	6	0	04	29
	10	11	0	22	93
	11	10	0	11	07
	11	9	0	06	63
	12	23अ	0	02	20
	11	2ब	0	13	85
	11	23अ	0	04	64

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 76 सारवाय	232	4	0	13	35
	232	8	0	00	40
	232	6	0	02	86
	232	5	0	12	28
	231	4	0	04	50
	231	5	0	08	32
	231	3	0	07	27
	204	7	0	02	68
	204	18	0	04	85
	204	8	0	00	52
	204	17	0	01	16
	204	16	0	02	61
	204	15	0	04	06
	204	14	0	02	41
	204	10	0	05	00
	203	3	0	00	98
	205	15ब	0	08	63
	201	2क1	0	06	23
	201	1	0	14	54
	201	2ब	0	01	31
	198	7	0	01	61
	198	10	0	07	23
	198	11	0	00	67
	198	9	0	00	40
	200	1	0	03	79
	198	5	0	01	81
	200	2	0	07	65
	200	3	0	12	68
	284	11	0	06	03
	284	4	0	05	08
	284	10	0	03	68
	284	6	0	07	28
	284	5	0	05	98
	285	11	0	05	31

1	2	3	4	5	6
	285	10	0	04	02
	285	9	0	06	83
	285	2	0	03	09
	285	3	0	07	18
	332	5	0	14	14
	332	4	0	09	69
	332	3	0	13	92
	332	1	0	06	32
	336	10	0	03	24
	336	8	0	04	53
	336	7	0	02	12
	336	4	0	08	97
	336	6	0	03	69
	339	7ब	0	00	88
	339	8	0	08	81
	339	11	0	07	79
	339	10	0	00	40
	340	5	0	17	21
	340	6	0	02	15
	340	9	0	02	27
	343	2	0	00	40
	317	12	0	05	92
	317	13	0	00	40
	317	11	0	00	52
	317	9	0	00	40
	345	11	0	01	19
	345	10	0	04	50
	345	9	0	01	75
	345	8	0	01	16
	345	7	0	00	55
	345	6	0	06	44
	345	5	0	00	89
	345	3	0	04	67
नं. 75 सदासिवपुरम	175	6	0	03	33
	175	5	0	03	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	175	4	0	02	06
	175	3	0	06	31
	177	9	0	03	78
	177	8	0	01	38
	177	2	0	00	40
	175	2	0	03	45
	174	10ख2	0	07	46
	174	9ख	0	01	98
	174	9ख	0	02	82
	178	8	0	00	40
	178	9ख	0	00	57
	178	93अ	0	01	29
	178	153अ	0	00	50
	178	15ख	0	00	50
	179	12	0	03	73
	179	11	0	03	24
	179	3ख	0	00	40
	179	33अ	0	03	56
	179	4	0	04	07
	179	5	0	01	70
	179	8	0	08	60
	170	10	0	00	65
	169	10	0	16	32
	167	1ख	0	00	40
	167	1ड	0	15	12
	167	4	0	09	24
	162	11	0	10	67
	162	10	0	12	23
	162	8	0	05	03
	163	5	0	09	49
	163	3	0	01	74
	163	2	0	18	12
	120	8	0	21	93
	120	9	0	01	09

1	2	3	4	5	6
	119	5	0	03	38
	114	15	0	05	85
	114	12ड	0	00	40
	114	14	0	00	40
	114	12अ	0	04	52
	114	10ब	0	00	99
	114	12इ	0	02	34
	114	10अ	0	06	23
	114	6	0	04	14
	114	5	0	07	41
	124	14	0	06	16
	124	12	0	03	88
	124	11	0	08	92
	124	1	0	04	65
	63	2	0	12	93
	62	7	0	05	18
	62	5	0	03	22
	62	4	0	03	36
	62	1	0	11	44
	62	2	0	03	08
	60	3ब	0	00	40
	58	9एम	0	01	73
	60	3अ	0	01	60
	58	9एल	0	01	99
	58	9जे	0	02	30
	58	9ऐ	0	02	50
	58	9के	0	01	15
	58	9एफ	0	03	71
	58	9हेच	0	00	42
	58	9जि	0	00	41
	58	8	0	15	94
	58	6क	0	01	74
	58	6अ	0	01	36
	58	6ब	0	05	23

1	2	3	4	5	6
	58	4	0	03	11
	58	3	0	02	55
	56	7	0	04	96
	56	5	0	03	58
	56	2	0	09	60
	56	3	0	02	36
	51	2	0	12	97
	50	4	0	02	77
	36	8	0	00	56
	36	9ब	0	02	16
	36	9अ	0	00	40
	35	9अ3	0	06	50
	35	10	0	01	54
	34	8क	0	00	40
	34	8ब	0	00	40
	34	14	0	01	76
	33	9ब	0	05	27
	33	9अ	0	04	41
	24	14अ	0	05	10
	24	14ब	0	00	45
	20	32	0	01	08
	20	28	0	05	40
	20	27	0	07	20
	20	25	0	01	80
	20	26	0	02	42
	20	24	0	06	52
	20	19	0	05	06
	20	5	0	00	63
	20	4	0	06	66
	20	29	0	00	40
	20	3	0	02	52
	20	2	0	01	20
	20	1	0	15	48
नं. 72 वलैयमादेवि	76	1अ	0	04	27
	79	11	0	01	51
	79	5क2	0	13	85
	79	5क1	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	79	2	0	12	48
	79	33A2	0	03	60
	66	4ड	0	00	40
	66	4क	0	00	71
	66	4ब	0	02	91
	66	43A	0	03	20
	66	5ब	0	06	45
	66	6	0	00	40
	66	53A	0	07	17
	65	1	0	18	49
	63	13क	0	02	28
	63	12	0	00	40
	63	13ब	0	02	03
	63	133A	0	04	55
	63	8	0	04	31
	63	6	0	15	63
	63	5	0	00	40
	40	9	0	11	20
	40	11ब	0	07	17
	40	11क	0	04	10
	44	20	0	06	35
	44	15क	0	00	40
	44	15ब	0	01	00
	44	16क	0	02	50
	44	16ब	0	00	48
	44	163A	0	02	70
	44	153A	0	00	68
	44	12	0	05	74
	44	11	0	11	50
	44	10	0	03	72
	46	10	0	05	75
	46	9	0	06	97
	46	4	0	03	21
	45	1	0	01	58

1	2	3	4	5	6
	46	3	0	04	52
	46	2ब	0	09	58
	48	8एल	0	08	06
	48	8क्यू	0	01	72
	48	8पि	0	02	81
	48	8ओ	0	14	38
	48	9अ	0	00	40
	34	1ब	0	05	05
	34	1क	0	10	67
	34	1अ	0	01	93
	32	19ब	0	13	55
	34	43अ1	0	04	56
	33	20	0	02	45
	33	15ब	0	00	40
	33	15अ	0	03	01
	33	19	0	03	96
	33	18	0	00	40
	105	11अ	0	10	38
	105	3	0	01	94
	105	2	0	03	35
	105	1	0	08	58
	107	2	0	04	45
	109	2	0	18	08
	109	7	0	02	22
	109	8	0	01	41
	123	2	0	01	96
	124	4	0	26	56
	125	2	0	16	62
	126	1ब1	0	07	96
	125	1क	0	04	89
	125	1अ	0	00	40
	34	2	0	02	19
	125	1ब	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 71 तुलुक्कनूर	172	2	0	15	39
	172	1ब	0	23	16
	171	1ब	0	24	44
	149	2	0	70	03
	140	2	0	16	95
	140	1	0	28	18
	136	2ब	0	12	26
	129	4	0	13	33
	135	4	0	44	26
	135	3	0	09	13
	132	2ब	0	01	36
	132	3	0	15	42
	132	5	0	00	40
नं. 70 आत्तूर टाउन	वार्ड एफ ब्लॉक नं. 19				
	6	3	0	26	56
	6	4	0	00	40
	6	1	0	26	61
	3	2	0	16	64
	2	5	0	17	64
	2	2	0	16	92
	वार्ड एफ ब्लॉक नं. 17				
	2	5	0	20	98
	2	3	0	16	92
	1	3	0	18	91
	1	4	0	09	03
	3	2	0	08	83
	वार्ड एफ ब्लॉक नं. 16				
	13	6	0	00	40
	13	7	0	09	92
	14	1	0	00	40
	14	2	0	17	52
	9	2	0	09	89
	9	1	0	09	35

1	2	3	4	5	6
	2	2	0	28	82
	1	1	0	00	40
	1	3	0	19	13
	4	1	0	01	19
	4	2	0	01	37
	4	3	0	02	19
	वार्ड एफ ब्लॉक नं. 13				
	7	23	0	19	03
	6	2	0	18	89
	वार्ड एफ ब्लॉक नं. 12				
	14	3	0	00	59
	14	4	0	00	40
	14	5	0	02	72
	14	2	0	00	64
	7	13	0	01	78
	8	10	0	02	49
	8	1	0	01	15
	8	11	0	22	96
	8	5	0	03	84
	8	4	0	04	26
	8	3	0	00	76
	9	5	0	01	76
	9	2	0	17	45
	9	3	0	01	30
	वार्ड ई ब्लॉक नं. 14				
	11	9	0	02	00
	11	7	0	14	52
	11	1	0	05	87
	11	5	0	03	33
	8	4	0	01	08
	4	5	0	01	87
	4	1	0	19	97
	वार्ड ई ब्लॉक नं. 12				
	3	16	0	01	99
	3	13	0	10	64
	3	12	0	00	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	3	11	0	00	94
	3	4	0	13	70
	3	2	0	04	95
	3	3	0	12	13
	4	9	0	15	46
	5	1	0	00	40
	4	8	0	00	55
	5	3	0	21	17
नं. 52 नरसिंगपुरम	340	4	0	01	00
	340	2	0	20	61
	340	1	0	05	54
	340	3	0	10	77
	341	2ड3	0	18	76
	341	2ड2	0	09	23
	341	2क	0	01	30
	341	2ब	0	08	57
	342	1जि	0	04	80
	342	1एफ	0	14	59
	342	1इ	0	00	90
	342	1ड	0	01	86
	342	1अ	0	14	45
	326	3	0	22	73
	326	5	0	03	91
	326	10	0	01	33
	326	4	0	00	40
	326	9	0	22	52
	326	6	0	01	72
	325	2	0	43	46
	325	3	0	01	40
	318	3	0	02	55
	318	2	0	05	95

1	2	3	4	5	6
	318	1	0	06	15
	317	1	0	17	05
	403	2	0	24	03
	403	1ड	0	37	19
	399	4ड	0	01	41
	403	1क	0	01	78
	403	1ब	0	03	40
	399	4जि	0	12	89
	399	4एफ	0	00	50
	399	5अ	0	03	44
	399	1इ	0	03	58
	399	1क	0	03	98
	316	4	0	02	50
	304	3अ	0	09	21
	304	1अ	0	15	61
	386	3जि	0	00	40
	379	1	0	33	15
	380	2	0	23	91
	380	1	0	11	14
	384	2	0	05	15
	306	2ब	0	03	74
	306	2अ	0	04	70
	306	6अ	0	03	21
	392	4	0	00	72
	391	1	0	14	09
	369	11	0	02	60
	369	10	0	02	77
	369	9	0	06	20
	369	6	0	06	25
	370	2	0	24	36
	370	1	0	06	62
	295	7	0	16	32
	295	10	0	06	65
	295	8	0	06	14

	2	3	4	5	6
	377	5	0	01	87
	377	4	0	13	88
	377	1	0	14	68
	377	3	0	00	40
	299	4	0	06	32
	299	2	0	04	03
	299	3अ	0	00	52
नं. 42 तांडवरायपुरम	149	4अ	0	05	51
	149	4ब	0	06	96
	170	5क	0	12	59
	170	4	0	12	55
	170	2	0	07	31
	169	5	0	10	17
	169	4	0	06	78
	169	3	0	13	51
	168	4	0	20	21
	163	6	0	12	13
	162	12	0	12	52
	162	10	0	05	89
	159	8	0	07	69
	159	9ड	0	01	42
	159	9क	0	03	59
	159	9ब	0	00	83
	159	9अ	0	07	47
	160	9अ	0	00	40
	160	10	0	14	39
	160	1	0	03	90
	157	12	0	04	12
	157	6	0	03	45
	157	17	0	06	77
	157	16	0	04	16
	157	13	0	01	61
	157	4	0	03	20
	157	3क	0	06	64
	157	3अ	0	05	51
	156	1ब1	0	01	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
	156	13A	0	02	58
	155	4	0	18	77
	155	1	0	12	31
	155	2	0	00	40
नं. 44 ईच्चमपट्टि	170	4	0	22	20
	171	2	0	05	53
	170	3	0	08	98
	171	1	0	11	62
	168	3	0	16	95
	169	.	0	25	52
	155	3	0	22	28
	155	23A	0	01	83
	154	3	0	08	04
	154	4	0	08	32
	154	1	0	13	03
	150	23	0	11	76
	150	3	0	02	37
	149	3ब2	0	14	10
	149	3ब1	0	02	55
	149	1हेच	0	12	20
नं. 45 सिलियमपट्टि	278	5	0	09	92
	278	23A	0	07	45
	277	2ब	0	07	14
	277	3A	0	05	10
	277	4ब	0	09	43
	277	4क	0	02	65
	276	23A	0	14	42
	274	.	0	33	85
	273	53A	0	01	18
	125	3	0	00	50
	138	5	0	00	72
	273	9	0	01	09
	138	4	0	22	42
	143	10	0	01	59

1	2	3	4	5	6
	143	9ब	0	00	40
	143	93अ	0	12	10
	143	23अ	0	05	50
	143	3	0	03	10
	143	2ब	0	04	41
	143	13अ	0	00	46
	145	1	0	01	82
	146	4	0	08	36
	146	5	0	00	40
	146	7	0	05	43
	166	13	0	04	75
	166	10	0	10	69
	166	5	0	06	10
	166	4	0	09	56
	169	8	0	06	26
	169	7	0	05	94
	169	6	0	05	08
	169	5	0	00	45
	169	1	0	17	46
	170	15	0	09	28
	170	8	0	05	48
	170	7	0	04	03
	170	4	0	06	74
	170	3	0	03	87
	173	18	0	03	92
	173	16	0	04	76
	173	14ब	0	00	42
	173	13	0	00	42
	173	143अ	0	02	92
	173	11	0	00	40
	173	123अ	0	04	26
	173	103अ	0	04	00
	178	11	0	08	38
	178	9	0	01	09

1	2	3	4	5	6
	178	8	0	07	03
	177	18	0	06	34
	177	17	0	04	31
	177	9	0	00	40
	177	10	0	10	80
	177	11	0	00	77
	184	7ब	0	05	38
	184	6	0	06	90
	184	73अ	0	09	83
	184	5	0	00	40
	184	8	0	15	55
	183	10	0	19	46
	188	1	0	17	77
	194	19	0	00	54
	194	16	0	00	40
	194	18	0	01	98
	194	13	0	10	23
	194	123अ	0	00	40
	194	12इ	0	01	70
	194	12उ	0	04	48
	194	12क	0	02	59
	194	12ख	0	02	86
	194	8	0	01	11
	194	6ब	0	11	26
	194	63अ	0	00	87
	197	8	0	15	96
	197	3ब	0	00	40
	197	12	0	00	40
	197	7	0	00	55
	197	103अ	0	17	47
	197	10ब	0	00	77
	203	7ब	0	06	20
	203	73अ	0	01	67
	203	6	0	05	57

1	2	3	4	5	6
	203	5इ	0	03	52
	203	5ड	0	01	80
	204	16ब	0	01	21
	204	16अ	0	11	01
	204	15	0	02	76
	204	14	0	02	11
	204	11	0	00	40
	204	12	0	03	19
	204	13	0	00	57
	205	3	0	01	32
	205	4	0	01	90
	205	5	0	04	22
	205	2	0	00	40
नं. 46 मल्लिकार्जुन	57	3	0	04	66
	302	2	0	51	46
	58	.	0	00	40
	59	2	0	02	99
	302	1	0	05	51
	301	5	0	05	23
	301	4	0	10	03
	301	2	0	20	65
	64	5	0	10	73
	63	2	0	00	40
	63	1	0	01	64
	287	6	0	11	17
	64	2	0	07	01
	284	1	0	22	61
	281	2	0	27	92
	285	18	0	03	09
	283	1	0	06	15
	282	3	0	12	50
	282	1	0	00	86
	282	2	0	02	11
	98	2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	241	10	0	08	79
	233	10	0	08	50
	233	7	0	15	30
	233	8	0	00	67
	233	5	0	08	89
	233	4	0	00	87
	232	2	0	00	40
	235	8	0	03	15
	229	3	0	25	27
	110	3	0	18	69
	198	8	0	11	43
	114	.	0	06	86
	199	1जे	0	09	78
	199	1ऐ	0	01	69
	199	5	0	00	43
	199	3ड	0	00	40
	199	1इ	0	01	20
	199	1एफ	0	02	65
	199	1ड	0	08	76
	200	2	0	03	67
	200	1	0	29	53
	119	4	0	08	51
	183	.	0	25	26
	184	.	0	29	62
	185	.	0	30	53
	124	3	0	06	13
	124	1	0	00	99
	122	4	0	20	77
	122	3	0	01	41
नं. 49 अरसनत्तम	320	5अ	0	16	00
	320	5ब	0	13	31
	320	8अ	0	09	60
	320	7	0	11	00
	320	4	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	256	7	0	02	61
	256	6	0	00	40
	256	1	0	03	05
	238	3ब	0	07	90
	238	3अ	0	08	98
	238	1क	0	09	60
	238	1अ	0	08	65
	234	1क	0	03	98
	234	1अ	0	09	63
	234	1ब	0	01	29
	233	3जि	0	09	56
	233	3एफ	0	07	41
	233	3इ	0	02	53
	233	3ब	0	04	58
	233	3अ	0	00	40
	233	2	0	15	37
	233	1ब	0	05	36
	233	1अ	0	04	57
	231	3क	0	16	97
	231	3ड	0	06	50
	231	3ब	0	12	43
	231	2अ	0	01	87
नं. 48 गोपालपुरम	62	4	0	22	09
	62	3ब	0	05	15
	62	1ब	0	09	70
	62	2ब	0	04	84
	62	2अ	0	04	61
	62	1अ	0	11	27
	61	8	0	08	40
	61	5	0	07	83
	60	11	0	03	80
	60	10	0	03	39
	60	9	0	03	88
	60	8	0	06	21

1	2	3	4	5	6
	60	7	0	08	93
	60	6	0	09	40
	60	5	0	10	10
	60	3	0	00	87
	87	17ब	0	05	79
	87	17अ	0	01	82
	60	2	0	09	84
	87	16अ	0	04	57
	87	15	0	03	61
	87	14	0	03	88
	56	5	0	00	40
	87	13	0	03	30
	87	12	0	05	99
	87	11	0	05	95
	87	10	0	02	98
	87	9	0	03	70
	87	2	0	02	77
	87	1	0	02	55
	54	7	0	12	04
	93	15	0	10	28
	93	6	0	05	90
	93	7	0	03	82
	93	12	0	01	55
	93	11	0	05	46
	93	8	0	00	43
	93	10	0	02	00
	93	9	0	00	40
	93	2	0	15	93
	104	1	0	03	27
	105	1क	0	13	11
	105	1अ	0	34	81
	13	2	0	19	17
	14	2	0	23	56
	9	2ब	0	27	14
	9	1ब	0	10	20

1	2	3	4	5	6
तालूका : गंगावल्ली	जिला : सेलम	राज्य : तमिलनाडु			
नं. 25 ओटियत्तूर	26	9अ	0	00	93
	5	3एफ	0	01	93
	5	3इ	0	09	77
	5	3ड	0	07	42
	5	3ब	0	02	53
	5	3क	0	01	74
	5	3अ	0	00	40
	5	2	0	19	26
	5	5	0	07	41
	5	4	0	07	91
	4	3	0	03	07
	4	23अ	0	11	34
	4	2ब	0	02	08
	4	2क	0	11	87
	3	4ब	0	07	85
	3	43अ	0	02	33
	3	5	0	02	25
	3	3अ2	0	00	40
	3	1	0	15	26
	2	2इ	0	00	40
तालूका : संकरि	जिला : सेलम	राज्य : तमिलनाडु			
नं. 21 मोरूर	634	2	0	32	85
	633	1	0	05	10
	632	.	0	38	37
	610	4अ	0	07	39
	610	8	0	03	27
	610	2	0	01	26
	610	9	0	04	32
	610	11अ2	0	00	40
	611	7	0	02	52
	610	11अ1	0	03	46
	610	7ब	0	00	40
	610	7अ1	0	06	48
	610	7अ2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	613	10	0	02	00
	613	113अ1	0	06	12
	613	9	0	00	43
	613	7	0	00	40
	613	11ब1	0	01	00
	613	6	0	05	76
	613	2	0	18	20
	615	1	0	13	56
	613	3	0	02	55
	617	1ब	0	06	48
	617	23अ	0	06	66
	617	13अ	0	00	40
	623	13अ	0	04	69
	623	1ब	0	13	75
	623	23अ	0	00	74
	622	4क	0	00	40
	622	4ड	0	03	82
	622	4इ	0	03	52
	622	5	0	06	17
	622	4ब	0	07	44
	479	2	0	10	34
	471	4	0	17	43
	471	3	0	05	14
	471	23अ	0	01	85
	471	2ब	0	07	32
	468	4	0	12	37
	468	3	0	25	84
	467	2	0	20	28
	467	13अ	0	05	44
	465	15	0	06	34
	464	4	0	12	36
	464	3	0	00	86
	464	2	0	10	12
	454	4	0	08	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	454	2	0	02	12
	436	5	0	01	80
	436	1	0	21	95
	437	1इ	0	19	80
	431	.	0	42	53
	441	2क2	0	11	05
	441	2ब	0	03	27
	441	2अ	0	06	20
	441	4अ	0	09	42
	376	1ब2	0	00	40
	376	1ब1	0	00	70
	378	2क1	0	01	92
	378	2क3	0	00	40
	378	2ब	0	11	64
	378	2अ	0	08	27
	378	3ब	0	10	80
	359	4	0	02	09
	359	3	0	00	40
	359	2	0	32	25
	359	1	0	07	28
	385	2	0	06	90
	385	1ब	0	00	65
	385	1अ	0	11	86
	384	12ब	0	00	52
नं. 22 कस्तूरिपट्ट	234	2	0	25	31
	236	2	0	28	14
	237	52	0	05	25
	237	51	0	00	40
	237	53	0	07	87
	237	45	0	11	08
	237	8	0	06	63
	237	36	0	00	43
	237	9	0	01	72
	237	10	0	02	47
	237	12	0	04	16
	237	31	0	02	01
	237	21	0	02	97

1	2	3	4	5	6
	237	30	0	06	47
	237	29	0	00	40
	237	28	0	00	61
	237	27	0	01	06
	237	26	0	01	87
	237	25	0	03	48
	237	23	0	00	40
	180	1	0	20	60
	179	2	0	14	48
	179	1	0	15	52
	178	2	0	26	60
	177	2ए	0	21	88
	177	2हेच	0	06	98

[फ़. सं. आर-25011/14/2004-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1736.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R. Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 4/2, Arockiasamy Street, Crawford Colony, Tiruchirappalli-620 012, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Attur		District : Salem		State : Tamil Nadu		
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO. 98 PERIYERI	30	3	0	23	10	
	29	1	0	00	40	
	38	1	0	16	53	
	38	4	0	02	36	
	38	2	0	08	03	
	39	1	0	31	30	
	44	4	0	22	04	
	45	2B	0	04	70	
	193	3	0	06	80	
	193	4A	0	03	80	
	193	1A2	0	16	18	
	193	1C	0	06	46	
	53	2D	0	03	21	
	54	1	0	08	80	
	54	3	0	20	67	
	54	2A	0	00	40	
	56	2A	0	18	11	
	57	2B	0	03	68	
	57	2A	0	21	80	
	57	3A	0	03	65	
	422	3	0	23	36	
	58	2	0	26	16	
	115	1	0	16	80	
	113	2B	0	22	60	
	114	1	0	00	40	
	109	4B	0	36	84	
	107	2B	0	16	52	
	106	2B	0	34	04	
	103	8A	0	12	47	
	103	7	0	00	40	
	103	5A	0	14	24	

1	2	3	4	5	6
	103	9A	0	02	09
	103	5B	0	02	56
	103	1A	0	01	12
	103	1B	0	05	22
	102	2	0	06	04
	102	1	0	00	40
	124	1B	0	08	01
	124	1C	0	10	76
	124	1E	0	00	40
	124	1D	0	09	11
	124	1F	0	02	27
	131	8B	0	06	45
	131	8A	0	05	78
	130	7	0	00	40
	130	2B	0	03	82
	131	19	0	02	97
	131	4B	0	00	40
	130	2A	0	11	12
	130	1	0	10	03
	134	6	0	06	57
	133	7	0	00	40
	134	5	0	19	15
	134	1	0	09	86
NO. 97 NATHAKARAI	108	7	0	09	72
	108	6	0	07	52
	108	4A	0	07	38
	108	3	0	07	01
	108	2B	0	02	96
	108	2A	0	02	24
	108	1	0	07	21
	97	3B	0	05	18
	97	3A	0	06	37
	97	4	0	09	51
	97	5	0	08	92
	96	1A	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 94 THIYAGANUR	96	10	0	00	40
	96	11	0	00	40
	95	15A2	0	03	71
	95	15A3	0	06	54
	95	15A4	0	05	33
	32	6B	0	07	69
	32	6C	0	00	71
	34	4	0	00	60
	34	3	0	12	12
	36	2	0	00	40
	37	10	0	02	29
	37	9	0	03	78
	37	8	0	03	83
	37	7	0	03	79
	37	6	0	03	65
	37	4	0	00	40
	37	5	0	02	60
	37	11	0	00	40
	37	12	0	03	72
	37	13	0	01	67
	37	14	0	00	40
	58	8B	0	00	40
	58	6	0	06	88
	58	5B	0	08	13
	58	5A	0	06	23
	58	2	0	03	23
	29	2B	0	11	10
	29	2A	0	18	77
	7	7	0	09	53
	7	6	0	09	60
	7	5	0	13	41
	7	2B	0	00	44
	13	1	0	04	70
	11	3A2	0	14	70
	11	3A1	0	11	22

1	2	3	4	5	6
	11	2A	0	09	75
	11	1A	0	16	90
	15	1	0	00	40
	10	1A	0	00	93
	10	7B2	0	11	55
	10	7B1	0	01	01
	10	1C2	0	04	17
	10	1C1	0	02	88
	10	6B	0	06	59
	10	2B2	0	00	40
	10	2B1	0	04	38
	10	5	0	00	75
	16	1A	0	05	48
	59	1	0	02	48
NO.95 MUMMUDI	111	15	0	10	21
	111	13	0	07	27
	111	11	0	05	86
	111	9	0	01	35
	112	1	0	09	45
	110	3	0	30	15
	109	4	0	03	06
	108	1A	0	09	50
	108	1B	0	20	79
	107	8	0	10	08
	107	7	0	11	40
	117	5	0	19	61
	117	4B	0	11	67
	117	4A	0	09	33
	117	3	0	05	43
	117	7	0	08	75
	143	5	0	07	95
	73	2	0	14	27
	73	1	0	20	66
	67	4	0	24	86
	67	3	0	03	97

1	2	3	4	5	6
	67	1	0	22	71
	139	3	0	01	83
	135	1	0	02	15
	136	4	0	35	57
	146	3	0	11	23
	147	3	0	26	04
	148	5	0	11	39
	148	6	0	12	78
	149	4	0	17	93
	150	3	0	00	40
	150	2	0	04	97
NO. 86 DEVIYAKURICHI	187	3D	0	10	42
	187	3C	0	01	21
	187	3B	0	10	60
	187	3A	0	05	45
	187	2	0	04	11
	187	1	0	07	37
	190	4	0	06	48
	190	7	0	05	51
	190	2	0	10	06
	190	1B	0	05	18
	190	1A	0	02	16
	190	5	0	00	91
	191	13	0	11	97
	191	6	0	03	78
	191	4	0	04	18
	191	1	0	02	06
	191	3	0	00	40
	191	2	0	05	81
	181	8	0	14	55
	180	1	0	01	27
	179	4	0	01	91
	179	2A	0	02	87
	179	2B	0	04	78

1	2	3	4	5	6
	179	5	0	08	00
	178	6	0	16	03
	178	3	0	08	66
	174	1	0	01	64
	175	4	0	01	05
	175	5	0	06	98
	175	6	0	06	62
	175	7	0	12	30
	176	7	0	18	26
	160	8	0	09	72
	160	11	0	01	99
	160	10	0	01	92
	160	7	0	07	39
	160	6	0	06	20
	161	4	0	00	66
	161	7	0	05	99
	161	8	0	07	16
	161	2	0	04	60
	151	14	0	03	80
	151	13	0	07	96
	151	4	0	13	83
	150	3A	0	15	63
	142	-	0	21	05
	143	1C	0	00	40
	143	1B	0	00	40
	143	1A	0	14	77
	141	2B	0	10	82
	141	2A	0	01	94
	144	1	0	02	15
	140	3A	0	07	83
	138	4A	0	08	30
	138	5	0	14	46
	137	1B	0	19	77
	137	1A	0	06	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	136	5	0	12	24
	136	4	0	08	92
	136	3	0	06	95
	136	2	0	00	40
	135	1	0	10	80
	134	2	0	10	05
	134	1	0	16	30
	134	3	0	04	04
	133	3	0	18	36
	133	2	0	08	87
NO. 87. VADAKUMARAI	48	5	0	01	27
	48	4	0	02	08
	48	3	0	03	40
	48	2	0	03	21
	48	1	0	02	95
	47	12	0	03	34
	47	11	0	02	72
	47	10	0	06	19
	47	3	0	02	27
	47	2	0	04	67
	5	2	0	11	26
	5	3	0	11	65
	5	7	0	00	40
	5	4	0	22	21
	5	5	0	00	54
	9	4	0	10	10
	9	5	0	00	40
	9	6	0	04	29
	10	11	0	22	93
	11	10	0	11	07
	11	9	0	06	63
	12	2A	0	02	20
	11	2B	0	13	85
	11	2A	0	04	64

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 76 SARVAI	232	4	0	13	35
	232	8	0	00	40
	232	6	0	02	86
	232	5	0	12	28
	231	4	0	04	50
	231	5	0	08	32
	231	3	0	07	27
	204	7	0	02	68
	204	18	0	04	85
	204	8	0	00	52
	204	17	0	01	16
	204	16	0	02	61
	204	15	0	04	06
	204	14	0	02	41
	204	10	0	05	00
	203	3	0	00	98
	205	15B	0	08	63
	201	2C1	0	06	23
	201	1	0	14	54
	201	2B	0	01	31
	198	7	0	01	61
	198	10	0	07	23
	198	11	0	00	67
	198	9	0	00	40
	200	1	0	03	79
	198	5	0	01	81
	200	2	0	07	65
	200	3	0	12	68
	284	11	0	06	03
	284	4	0	05	08
	284	10	0	03	68
	284	6	0	07	28
	284	5	0	05	98
	285	11	0	05	31

1	2	3	4	5	6
	285	10	0	04	02
	285	9	0	06	83
	285	2	0	03	09
	285	3	0	07	18
	332	5	0	14	14
	332	4	0	09	69
	332	3	0	13	92
	332	1	0	06	32
	336	10	0	03	24
	336	8	0	04	53
	336	7	0	02	12
	336	4	0	08	97
	336	6	0	03	69
	339	7B	0	00	88
	339	8	0	08	81
	339	11	0	07	79
	339	10	0	00	40
	340	5	0	17	21
	340	6	0	02	15
	340	9	0	02	27
	343	2	0	00	40
	317	12	0	05	92
	317	13	0	00	40
	317	11	0	00	52
	317	9	0	00	40
	345	11	0	01	19
	345	10	0	04	50
	345	9	0	01	75
	345	8	0	01	16
	345	7	0	00	55
	345	6	0	06	44
	345	5	0	00	89
	345	3	0	04	67
NO.75. SADASIVAPURAM	175	6	0	03	33
	175	5	0	03	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	175	4	0	02	06
	175	3	0	06	31
	177	9	0	03	78
	177	8	0	01	38
	177	2	0	00	40
	175	2	0	03	45
	174	10B2	0	07	46
	174	9C	0	01	98
	174	9B	0	02	82
	178	8	0	00	40
	178	9B	0	00	57
	178	9A	0	01	29
	178	15A	0	00	50
	178	15B	0	00	50
	179	12	0	03	73
	179	11	0	03	24
	179	3B	0	00	40
	179	3A	0	03	56
	179	4	0	04	07
	179	5	0	01	70
	179	8	0	08	60
	170	10	0	00	65
	169	10	0	16	32
	167	1B	0	00	40
	167	1D	0	15	12
	167	4	0	09	24
	162	11	0	10	67
	162	10	0	12	23
	162	8	0	05	03
	163	5	0	09	49
	163	3	0	01	74
	163	2	0	18	12
	120	8	0	21	93
	120	9	0	01	09

1	2	3	4	5	6
	119	5	0	03	38
	114	15	0	05	85
	114	12D	0	00	40
	114	14	0	00	40
	114	12A	0	04	52
	114	10B	0	00	99
	114	12E	0	02	34
	114	10A	0	06	23
	114	6	0	04	14
	114	5	0	07	41
	124	14	0	06	16
	124	12	0	03	88
	124	11	0	08	92
	124	1	0	04	65
	63	2	0	12	93
	62	7	0	05	18
	62	5	0	03	22
	62	4	0	03	36
	62	1	0	11	44
	62	2	0	03	08
	60	3B	0	00	40
	58	9M	0	01	73
	60	3A	0	01	60
	58	9L	0	01	99
	58	9J	0	02	30
	58	9I	0	02	50
	58	9K	0	01	15
	58	9F	0	03	71
	58	9H	0	00	42
	58	9G	0	00	41
	58	8	0	15	94
	58	6C	0	01	74
	58	6A	0	01	36
	58	6B	0	05	23

1	2	3	4	5	6
	58	4	0	03	11
	58	3	0	02	55
	56	7	0	04	96
	56	5	0	03	58
	56	2	0	09	60
	56	3	0	02	36
	51	2	0	12	97
	50	4	0	02	77
	36	8	0	00	56
	36	9B	0	02	16
	36	9A	0	00	40
	35	9A3	0	06	50
	35	10	0	01	54
	34	8C	0	00	40
	34	8B	0	00	40
	34	14	0	01	76
	33	9B	0	05	27
	33	9A	0	04	41
	24	14A	0	05	10
	24	14B	0	00	45
	20	32	0	01	08
	20	28	0	05	40
	20	27	0	07	20
	20	25	0	01	80
	20	26	0	02	42
	20	24	0	06	52
	20	19	0	05	06
	20	5	0	00	63
	20	4	0	06	66
	20	29	0	00	40
	20	3	0	02	52
	20	2	0	01	20
	20	1	0	15	48
NO.72 VALAIYAMADEVI	76	1A	0	04	27
	79	11	0	01	51
	79	5C2	0	13	85
	79	5C1	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	79	2	0	12	48
	79	3A2	0	03	60
	66	4D	0	00	40
	66	4C	0	00	71
	66	4B	0	02	91
	66	4A	0	03	20
	66	5B	0	06	45
	66	6	0	00	40
	66	5A	0	07	17
	65	1	0	18	49
	63	13C	0	02	28
	63	12	0	00	40
	63	13B	0	02	03
	63	13A	0	04	55
	63	8	0	04	31
	63	6	0	15	63
	63	5	0	00	40
	40	9	0	11	20
	40	11B	0	07	17
	40	11C	0	04	10
	44	20	0	06	35
	44	15C	0	00	40
	44	15B	0	01	00
	44	16C	0	02	50
	44	16B	0	00	48
	44	16A	0	02	70
	44	15A	0	00	68
	44	12	0	05	74
	44	11	0	11	50
	44	10	0	03	72
	46	10	0	05	75
	46	9	0	06	97
	46	4	0	03	21
	45	1	0	01	58

1	2	3	4	5	6
	46	3	0	04	52
	46	2B	0	09	58
	48	8L	0	08	06
	48	8Q	0	01	72
	48	8P	0	02	81
	48	8O	0	14	38
	48	9A	0	00	40
	34	1B	0	05	05
	34	1C	0	10	67
	34	1A	0	01	93
	32	19B	0	13	55
	34	4A1	0	04	56
	33	20	0	02	45
	33	15B	0	00	40
	33	15A	0	03	01
	33	19	0	03	96
	33	18	0	00	40
	105	11A	0	10	38
	105	3	0	01	94
	105	2	0	03	35
	105	1	0	08	58
	107	2	0	04	45
	109	2	0	18	08
	109	7	0	02	22
	109	8	0	01	41
	123	2	0	01	96
	124	4	0	26	56
	125	2	0	16	62
	126	1B1	0	07	96
	125	1C	0	04	89
	125	1A	0	00	40
	34	2	0	02	19
	125	1B	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 71 THULUKKANUR	172	2	0	15	39
	172	1B	0	23	16
	171	1B	0	24	44
	149	2	0	70	03
	140	2	0	16	95
	140	1	0	28	18
	136	2B	0	12	26
	129	4	0	13	33
	135	4	0	44	26
	135	3	0	09	13
	132	2B	0	01	36
	132	3	0	15	42
	132	5	0	00	40
	Ward F Block No. 19				
NO. 70 ATTUR TOWN	6	3	0	26	56
	6	4	0	00	40
	6	1	0	26	61
	3	2	0	16	64
	2	5	0	17	64
	2	2	0	16	92
	Ward F Block No. 17				
	2	5	0	20	98
	2	3	0	16	92
	1	3	0	18	91
	1	4	0	09	03
	3	2	0	08	83
	Ward F Block No. 16				
	13	6	0	00	40
	13	7	0	09	92
	14	1	0	00	40
	14	2	0	17	52
	9	2	0	09	89
	9	1	0	09	35

1	2	3	4	5	6
	2	2	0	28	82
	1	1	0	00	40
	1	3	0	19	13
	4	1	0	01	19
	4	2	0	01	37
	4	3	0	02	19
	Ward F Block No. 13				
	7	2A	0	19	03
	6	2	0	18	89
	Ward F Block No. 12				
	14	3	0	00	59
	14	4	0	00	40
	14	5	0	02	72
	14	2	0	00	64
	7	13	0	01	78
	8	10	0	02	49
	8	1	0	01	15
	8	11	0	22	96
	8	5	0	03	84
	8	4	0	04	26
	8	3	0	00	76
	9	5	0	01	76
	9	2	0	17	45
	9	3	0	01	30
	Ward E Block No. 14				
	11	9	0	02	00
	11	7	0	14	52
	11	1	0	05	87
	11	5	0	03	33
	8	4	0	01	08
	4	5	0	01	87
	4	1	0	19	97
	Ward E Block No. 12				
	3	16	0	01	99
	3	13	0	10	64
	3	12	0	00	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	3	11	0	00	94
	3	4	0	13	70
	3	2	0	04	95
	3	3	0	12	13
	4	9	0	15	46
	5	1	0	00	40
	4	8	0	00	55
	5	3	0	21	17
NO.52 NARASINGAPURAM	340	4	0	01	00
	340	2	0	20	61
	340	1	0	05	54
	340	3	0	10	77
	341	2D3	0	18	76
	341	2D2	0	09	23
	341	2C	0	01	30
	341	2B	0	08	57
	342	1G	0	04	80
	342	1F	0	14	59
	342	1E	0	00	90
	342	1D	0	01	86
	342	1A	0	14	45
	326	3	0	22	73
	326	5	0	03	91
	326	10	0	01	33
	326	4	0	00	40
	326	9	0	22	52
	326	6	0	01	72
	325	2	0	43	46
	325	3	0	01	40
	318	3	0	02	55
	318	2	0	05	95

1	2	3	4	5	6
	318	1	0	06	15
	317	1	0	17	05
	403	2	0	24	03
	403	1D	0	37	19
	399	4D	0	01	41
	403	1C	0	01	78
	403	1B	0	03	40
	399	4G	0	12	89
	399	4F	0	00	50
	399	5A	0	03	44
	399	1E	0	03	58
	399	1C	0	03	98
	316	4	0	02	50
	304	3A	0	09	21
	304	1A	0	15	61
	386	3G	0	00	40
	379	1	0	33	15
	380	2	0	23	91
	380	1	0	11	14
	384	2	0	05	15
	306	2B	0	03	74
	306	2A	0	04	70
	306	6A	0	03	21
	392	4	0	00	72
	391	1	0	14	09
	369	11	0	02	60
	369	10	0	02	77
	369	9	0	06	20
	369	6	0	06	25
	370	2	0	24	36
	370	1	0	06	62
	295	7	0	16	32
	295	10	0	06	65
	295	8	0	06	14

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.42 THANDAVARAYAPURAM	377	5	0	01	87
	377	4	0	13	88
	377	1	0	14	68
	377	3	0	00	40
	299	4	0	06	32
	299	2	0	04	03
	299	3A	0	00	52
	149	4A	0	05	51
	149	4B	0	06	96
	170	5C	0	12	59
	170	4	0	12	55
	170	2	0	07	31
	169	5	0	10	17
	169	4	0	06	78
	169	3	0	13	51
	168	4	0	20	21
	163	6	0	12	13
	162	12	0	12	52
	162	10	0	05	89
	159	8	0	07	69
	159	9D	0	01	42
	159	9C	0	03	59
	159	9B	0	00	83
	159	9A	0	07	47
	160	9A	0	00	40
	160	10	0	14	39
	160	1	0	03	90
	157	12	0	04	12
	157	6	0	03	45
	157	17	0	06	77
	157	16	0	04	16
	157	13	0	01	61
	157	4	0	03	20
	157	3C	0	06	64
	157	3A	0	05	51
	156	1B1	0	01	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
	156	1A	0	02	58
	155	4	0	18	77
	155	1	0	12	31
	155	2	0	00	40
NO. 44 EACHAMPATTI	170	4	0	22	20
	171	2	0	05	53
	170	3	0	08	98
	171	1	0	11	62
	168	3	0	16	95
	169	-	0	25	52
	155	3	0	22	28
	155	2A	0	01	83
	154	3	0	08	04
	154	4	0	08	32
	154	1	0	13	03
	150	2D	0	11	76
	150	3	0	02	37
	149	3B2	0	14	10
	149	3B1	0	02	55
	149	1H	0	12	20
NO 45 SEELIYAMPATTI	278	5	0	09	92
	278	2A	0	07	45
	277	2B	0	07	14
	277	3A	0	05	10
	277	4B	0	09	43
	277	4C	0	02	65
	276	2A	0	14	42
	274	-	0	33	85
	273	5A	0	01	18
	125	3	0	00	50
	138	5	0	00	72
	273	9	0	01	09
	138	4	0	22	42
	143	10	0	01	59

1	2	3	4	5	6
	143	9B	0	00	40
	143	9A	0	12	10
	143	2A	0	05	50
	143	3	0	03	10
	143	2B	0	04	41
	143	1A	0	00	46
	145	1	0	01	82
	146	4	0	08	36
	146	5	0	00	40
	146	7	0	05	43
	166	13	0	04	75
	166	10	0	10	69
	166	5	0	06	10
	166	4	0	09	56
	169	8	0	06	26
	169	7	0	05	94
	169	6	0	05	08
	169	5	0	00	45
	169	1	0	17	46
	170	15	0	09	28
	170	8	0	05	48
	170	7	0	04	03
	170	4	0	06	74
	170	3	0	03	87
	173	18	0	03	92
	173	16	0	04	76
	173	14B	0	00	42
	173	13	0	00	42
	173	14A	0	02	92
	173	11	0	00	40
	173	12A	0	04	26
	173	10A	0	04	00
	178	11	0	08	38
	178	9	0	01	09

1	2	3	4	5	6
	178	8	0	07	03
	177	18	0	06	34
	177	17	0	04	31
	177	9	0	00	40
	177	10	0	10	80
	177	11	0	00	77
	184	7B	0	05	38
	184	6	0	06	90
	184	7A	0	09	83
	184	5	0	00	40
	184	8	0	15	55
	183	10	0	19	46
	188	1	0	17	77
	194	19	0	00	54
	194	16	0	00	40
	194	18	0	01	98
	194	13	0	10	23
	194	12A	0	00	40
	194	12E	0	01	70
	194	12D	0	04	48
	194	12C	0	02	59
	194	12B	0	02	86
	194	8	0	01	11
	194	6B	0	11	26
	194	6A	0	00	87
	197	8	0	15	96
	197	3B	0	00	40
	197	12	0	00	40
	197	7	0	00	55
	197	10A	0	17	47
	197	10B	0	00	77
	203	7B	0	06	20
	203	7A	0	01	67
	203	6	0	05	57

1	2	3	4	5	6
	203	5E	0	03	52
	203	5D	0	01	80
	204	16B	0	01	21
	204	16A	0	11	01
	204	15	0	02	76
	204	14	0	02	11
	204	11	0	00	40
	204	12	0	03	19
	204	13	0	00	57
	205	3	0	01	32
	205	4	0	01	90
	205	5	0	04	22
	205	2	0	00	40
NO.46 MALLIYAKARAI	57	3	0	04	66
	302	2	0	51	46
	58	-	0	00	40
	59	2	0	02	99
	302	1	0	05	51
	301	5	0	05	23
	301	4	0	10	03
	301	2	0	20	65
	64	5	0	10	73
	63	2	0	00	40
	63	1	0	01	64
	287	6	0	11	17
	64	2	0	07	01
	284	1	0	22	61
	281	2	0	27	92
	285	18	0	03	09
	283	1	0	06	15
	282	3	0	12	50
	282	1	0	00	86
	282	2	0	02	11
	98	2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	241	10	0	08	79
	233	10	0	08	50
	233	7	0	15	30
	233	8	0	00	67
	233	5	0	08	89
	233	4	0	00	87
	232	2	0	00	40
	235	8	0	03	15
	229	3	0	25	27
	110	3	0	18	69
	198	8	0	11	43
	114	-	0	06	86
	199	1J	0	09	78
	199	1I	0	01	69
	199	5	0	00	43
	199	3D	0	00	40
	199	1E	0	01	20
	199	1F	0	02	65
	199	1D	0	08	76
	200	2	0	03	67
	200	1	0	29	53
	119	4	0	08	51
	183	-	0	25	26
	184	-	0	29	62
	185	-	0	30	53
	124	3	0	06	13
	124	1	0	00	99
	122	4	0	20	77
	122	3	0	01	41
NO.49 ARASANATHAM	320	5A	0	16	00
	320	5B	0	13	31
	320	8A	0	09	60
	320	7	0	11	00
	320	4	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	256	7	0	02	61
	256	6	0	00	40
	256	1	0	03	05
	238	3B	0	07	90
	238	3A	0	08	98
	238	1C	0	09	60
	238	1A	0	08	65
	234	1C	0	03	98
	234	1A	0	09	63
	234	1B	0	01	29
	233	3G	0	09	56
	233	3F	0	07	41
	233	3E	0	02	53
	233	3B	0	04	58
	233	3A	0	00	40
	233	2	0	15	37
	233	1B	0	05	36
	233	1A	0	04	57
	231	3C	0	16	97
	231	3D	0	06	50
	231	3B	0	12	43
	231	2A	0	01	87
NO.48 GOPALAPURAM	62	4	0	22	09
	62	3B	0	05	15
	62	1B	0	09	70
	62	2B	0	04	84
	62	2A	0	04	61
	62	1A	0	11	27
	61	8	0	08	40
	61	5	0	07	83
	60	11	0	03	80
	60	10	0	03	39
	60	9	0	03	88
	60	8	0	06	21

1	2	3	4	5	6
	60	7	0	08	93
	60	6	0	09	40
	60	5	0	10	10
	60	3	0	00	87
	87	17B	0	05	79
	87	17A	0	01	82
	60	2	0	09	84
	87	16A	0	04	57
	87	15	0	03	61
	87	14	0	03	88
	56	5	0	00	40
	87	13	0	03	30
	87	12	0	05	99
	87	11	0	05	95
	87	10	0	02	98
	87	9	0	03	70
	87	2	0	02	77
	87	1	0	02	55
	54	7	0	12	04
	93	15	0	10	28
	93	6	0	05	90
	93	7	0	03	82
	93	12	0	01	55
	93	11	0	05	46
	93	8	0	00	43
	93	10	0	02	00
	93	9	0	00	40
	93	2	0	15	93
	104	1	0	03	27
	105	1C	0	13	11
	105	1A	0	34	81
	13	2	0	19	17
	14	2	0	23	56
	9	2B	0	27	14
	9	1B	0	10	20

1	2	3	4	5	6
Taluk : Gangavalli	District : Salem		State : Tamil Nadu		
NO. 25 ODHIYATHUR	26	9A	0	00	93
	5	3F	0	01	93
	5	3E	0	09	77
	5	3D	0	07	42
	5	3B	0	02	53
	5	3C	0	01	74
	5	3A	0	00	40
	5	2	0	19	26
	5	5	0	07	41
	5	4	0	07	91
	4	3	0	03	07
	4	2A	0	11	34
	4	2B	0	02	08
	4	2C	0	11	87
	3	4B	0	07	85
	3	4A	0	02	33
	3	5	0	02	25
	3	3A2	0	00	40
	3	1	0	15	26
	2	2E	0	00	40
Taluk : Sankari	District : Salem		State : Tamil Nadu		
NO. 21 MORUR	634	2	0	32	85
	633	1	0	05	10
	632	-	0	38	37
	610	4A	0	07	39
	610	8	0	03	27
	610	2	0	01	26
	610	9	0	04	32
	610	11A2	0	00	40
	611	7	0	02	52
	610	11A1	0	03	46
	610	7B	0	00	40
	610	7A1	0	06	48
	610	7A2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	613	10	0	02	00
	613	11A1	0	06	12
	613	9	0	00	43
	613	7	0	00	40
	613	11B1	0	01	00
	613	6	0	05	76
	613	2	0	18	20
	615	1	0	13	56
	613	3	0	02	55
	617	1B	0	06	48
	617	2A	0	06	66
	617	1A	0	00	40
	623	1A	0	04	69
	623	1B	0	13	75
	623	2A	0	00	74
	622	4C	0	00	40
	622	4D	0	03	82
	622	4E	0	03	52
	622	5	0	06	17
	622	4B	0	07	44
	479	2	0	10	34
	471	4	0	17	43
	471	3	0	05	14
	471	2A	0	01	85
	471	2B	0	07	32
	468	4	0	12	37
	468	3	0	25	84
	467	2	0	20	28
	467	1A	0	05	44
	465	15	0	06	34
	464	4	0	12	36
	464	3	0	00	86
	464	2	0	10	12
	454	4	0	08	00

1	2	3	4	5	6
	454	2	0	02	12
	436	5	0	01	80
	436	1	0	21	95
	437	1E	0	19	80
	431	-	0	42	53
	441	2C2	0	11	05
	441	2B	0	03	27
	441	2A	0	06	20
	441	4A	0	09	42
	376	1B2	0	00	40
	376	1B1	0	00	70
	378	2C1	0	01	92
	378	2C3	0	00	40
	378	2B	0	11	64
	378	2A	0	08	27
	378	3B	0	10	80
	359	4	0	02	09
	359	3	0	00	40
	359	2	0	32	25
	359	1	0	07	28
	385	2	0	06	90
	385	1B	0	00	65
	385	1A	0	11	86
	384	12B	0	00	52
NO. 22 KASTHURIPATTI	234	2	0	25	31
	236	2	0	28	14
	237	52	0	05	25
	237	51	0	00	40
	237	53	0	07	87
	237	45	0	11	08
	237	8	0	06	63
	237	36	0	00	43
	237	9	0	01	72
	237	10	0	02	47
	237	12	0	04	16
	237	31	0	02	01
	237	21	0	02	97

1	2	3	4	5	6
	237	30	0	06	47
	237	29	0	00	40
	237	28	0	00	61
	237	27	0	01	06
	237	26	0	01	87
	237	25	0	03	48
	237	23	0	00	40
	180	1	0	20	60
	179	2	0	14	48
	179	1	0	15	52
	178	2	0	26	60
	177	2I	0	21	88
	177	2H	0	06	98

[No. R-25011/14/2004-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1737.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी चेन्नई - तिरुच्चि-मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 4/2, आरोकियासामी स्ट्रीट, क्राफोर्ड कालोनी, तिरुचिरापल्ली - 620012 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : रासिपुरम		जिला : नामक्कल		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिरसा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं 61 तिमिनायक्कनपट्टिट	226	1अ	0	13	09
	226	1ब	0	13	64
	227	1	0	01	00
	227	2	0	20	67
	224	3ब	0	14	87
	224	2	0	24	26
	203	2क1	0	09	76
	203	2इ	0	07	65
	203	2क2	0	00	58
	202	2	0	20	33
	201	4	0	11	55
	201	5	0	12	82
	201	2	0	02	43
	180	1	0	02	03
	180	2	0	27	83
	180	3अ	0	00	40
	169	4	0	19	77
	169	2	0	13	80
	169	3	0	03	13
	158	15	0	06	82
	158	11	0	02	40
	158	13	0	07	22
	158	14	0	02	97
	158	12	0	04	79
	160	3	0	20	99
	160	2ड	0	09	71
	160	2क	0	08	02
	161	2क	0	02	34
	161	2ब	0	20	16
	161	2अ2	0	10	80
	148	3	0	08	62
	148	1अ	0	07	93
	149	2	0	11	52

1	2	3	4	5	6
	149	4	0	09	05
	149	1ब	0	22	22
	149	13अ	0	01	79
	144	2	0	17	64
	144	1	0	13	06
	138	5	0	11	15
	138	3	0	03	87
	139	3	0	04	15
	139	2	0	07	75
	139	1क	0	05	96
नं. 60 ईश्वरमूर्तिपालैयम	161	2एफ	0	00	95
	161	2जि	0	00	45
	161	2इ	0	18	01
	161	2ब	0	00	49
	161	2क	0	19	54
	161	2ड	0	01	14
	161	1	0	10	22
	150	2ब3	0	28	58
	150	2ब4	0	02	03
	150	3ड	0	05	60
	150	3क	0	01	58
	150	3ब	0	00	67
	150	3अ	0	00	60
	143	5	0	00	40
	146	2ब	0	34	33
	146	2इ	0	00	92
	146	2ड	0	00	54
	146	2क	0	01	18
	146	2एफ	0	07	31
	146	2जि	0	00	40
	146	2अ	0	04	39
	145	7	0	14	35
	146	1	0	01	03
	182	3	0	20	22
	182	1	0	09	86
	183	5	0	10	25
	183	6	0	07	05
	183	7अ	0	10	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	186	5	0	08	52
	186	2	0	08	34
	186	1ब	0	10	48
	187	2	0	03	49
	187	1ड	0	10	74
	188	4ब	0	05	09
	188	4इ	0	03	91
	188	4ड	0	11	28
	188	4क	0	06	77
	188	5क	0	06	84
	196	9	0	01	70
	112	2हेच	0	08	88
	196	9	0	00	40
	196	1अ	0	14	78
	196	3	0	06	65
	196	2ब	0	15	60
	197	3ब	0	03	70
	197	3अ	0	01	10
	196	2अ	0	00	40
	197	2अ	0	03	63
	197	2ब	0	00	47
	197	2क	0	00	40
	197	1जि	0	02	01
	197	1अ	0	01	19
	197	1एफ	0	01	22
	197	1इ	0	08	47
	197	1ड	0	17	12
	198	1	0	00	40
	199	5	0	16	51
	205	1अ	0	18	01
	205	1ब	0	00	40
	206	3	0	13	45
	206	4अ	0	07	17
	209	1इ	0	00	40
	209	1एफ	0	08	24
	209	4ब	0	06	15
	209	4क	0	02	15
	209	3ब	0	03	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	209	3क	0	04	84
	210	7	0	00	40
	210	6अ	0	08	07
	209	2	0	02	28
	60	3ब	0	06	84
	58	4	0	14	88
	58	3	0	00	40
	58	5	0	13	43
	58	2ड	0	03	23
	58	1अ	0	00	58
	58	6क	0	03	43
	58	2अ	0	00	40
	58	6ब	0	03	61
	58	6अ	0	02	86
	58	7	0	05	30
	58	1क	0	00	40
	57	3इ	0	01	75
	57	3एफ	0	00	74
	57	3ड	0	08	83
	57	3क	0	01	88
	57	4अ	0	00	86
	56	4ब	0	12	51
	56	4क	0	06	39
	56	4ड	0	01	89
	55	3	0	02	52
	55	2ब	0	05	48
	55	2अ	0	00	40
	55	2क	0	00	91
	56	3	0	10	40
	56	2	0	13	56
	233	1	0	04	19
	35	1एफ	0	12	25
	35	1जि	0	10	97
	35	2ब	0	18	20
	237	3	0	00	40
	237	2	0	03	86
	237	1ड	0	02	24
	237	1इ	0	10	81
	237	5ब	0	04	82
	237	5अ	0	00	98
	239	9ब	0	01	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	239	9अ	0	04	53
	238	1ब	0	10	34
	238	13अ	0	10	77
	240	5	0	05	20
	240	4	0	05	87
	240	3अ	0	05	53
	240	2	0	07	64
	253	1एफ	0	07	21
	253	1इ	0	07	14
	255	4ड	0	00	92
	255	4क	0	08	37
	255	4अ	0	10	29
	256	3	0	08	79
	256	4	0	01	21
	256	2एफ	0	11	50
	256	2ड	0	08	45
	258	4अ	0	00	40
	258	3अ	0	03	00
	258	2ब	0	00	40
	258	4ब	0	00	40
	258	3ब	0	01	96
	258	2क	0	01	78
	258	2अ	0	02	29
	258	1	0	03	60
नं 59 मंगलापुरम	71	2	0	11	87
	71	1	0	08	90
	72	8	0	00	40
	71	3	0	00	40
	72	11	0	05	90
	72	8	0	00	40
	72	10	0	07	30
	72	9	0	05	48
	71	4	0	15	56
	71	5	0	04	33
	73	4ब	0	10	34
	73	4अ	0	00	40
	78	2अ	0	00	71
	78	1	0	11	27

1	2	3	4	5	6
	77	2	0	01	47
	77	1	0	00	40
	77	3	0	05	79
	• 77	4	0	06	07
	77	6अ	0	10	85
	77	7	0	01	62
	77	10	0	13	88
	84	7	0	01	96
	84	6	0	06	33
	84	8	0	08	90
	84	9	0	10	20
	85	2	0	09	47
	85	1	0	07	96
	85	3	0	00	40
	88	3अ	0	10	94
	88	2ब	0	20	28
	87	4ब2	0	00	40
	88	1	0	06	45
	237	2ब	0	08	67
	237	4	0	00	40
	237	3क	0	00	45
	237	3ब	0	09	51
	237	3अ	0	01	70
	238	2	0	12	19
	238	1अ	0	00	40
	238	1ब	0	11	23
	235	3क	0	00	40
	235	9	0	06	28
	235	4अ	0	02	51
	235	4ब	0	08	63
	235	7क	0	00	50
	235	7अ	0	06	05
	235	6	0	16	16
	235	5	0	03	77
	226	1	0	10	01
	230	4अ	0	05	58
	230	4ब	0	07	75
	230	4क	0	04	04

1	2	3	4	5	6
	230	4ड	0	02	33
	229	1अ	0	00	40
	230	3	0	05	15
	229	3	0	01	29
	230	2ड	0	00	85
	229	2	0	03	13
	229	1ब	0	03	71
	230	8	0	11	89
	230	5ब1	0	06	71
	230	5अ	0	01	07
	163	1अ	0	25	11
	163	1ब	0	00	64
	164	1ब	0	05	68
	165	10ब	0	07	94
	161	4ड	0	00	42
	161	4क	0	00	40
	165	7क	0	02	73
	165	10क	0	03	77
	165	7ब	0	08	49
	165	10अ	0	01	70
	165	10इ	0	02	75
	165	7अ	0	08	20
	165	10एफ	0	01	23
	165	3अ	0	01	99
	165	3एफ	0	02	70
	165	3इ	0	04	28
	166	1	0	21	97
	165	5ब	0	00	85
	166	4अ	0	10	12
	157	7	0	01	09
	157	5अ	0	13	89
	157	5ड	0	08	20
	156	2	0	09	63
	157	5क	0	00	63
	156	10ब	0	03	12
	156	3	0	01	49
	156	4	0	03	40
	156	5	0	03	14
	156	6	0	00	94

1	2	3	4	5	6
	155	13क	0	10	00
	155	13ब	0	02	47
	155	11	0	10	69
	155	9	0	01	51
	153	13अ	0	11	02
	153	1ब	0	09	23
	153	7क	0	01	61
	176	3	0	00	60
	176	4	0	06	69
	176	5	0	07	97
	176	2	0	00	40
	176	6ड	0	10	21
	176	6क	0	12	65
	177	6ड	0	06	51
	178	4क	0	02	83
	178	4ब	0	08	34
	178	4जि	0	03	62
	178	1	0	04	43
	178	2	0	05	88
नं. 58 नवलपट्टि	149	3	0	01	95
	149	2इ	0	06	35
	153	1क	0	06	13
	149	2क	0	13	11
	153	1ब	0	15	95
	153	3	0	02	14
नं. 57 आयलपट्टि	81	13अ	0	06	26
	81	2अ1	0	18	77
	81	2ब	0	00	86
	80	2ब2	0	27	70
	74	2	0	06	65
	74	3	0	35	22
	73	4	0	04	80
	73	5अ	0	15	26
	71	1ब	0	00	40
	71	1क	0	22	70
	72	1	0	01	00
	71	2	0	08	55

1	2	3	4	5	6
	108	1ब	0	00	40
	108	1अ	0	18	36
	108	2	0	08	52
	112	3	0	03	36
	112	7ब	0	12	96
	112	7अ	0	06	48
	112	6	0	11	16
	115	4	0	10	26
	119	1ब2	0	17	10
	119	2ब	0	10	61
	119	3अ	0	09	53
	119	3क	0	00	40
	119	3ब	0	08	37
	119	5ब	0	13	05
	123	3क	0	08	61
	123	3इ	0	06	39
	123	3उ	0	01	40
	125	2अ	0	01	08
	125	2ब	0	20	51
	135	1	0	16	91
	126	2	0	00	40
	135	3	0	13	01
	135	4	0	00	40
	135	5	0	01	31
	135	8	0	17	18
	135	7	0	00	40
	132	1	0	22	23
	132	2	0	08	82
	133	1क	0	00	40
	133	2	0	22	80
	177	1अ1	0	28	07
	177	1अ2	0	10	17
	177	1अ3	0	16	99
	177	1ब	0	01	24

1	2	3	4	5	6
	179	1ब	0	15	28
	179	1ड	0	14	98
	179	2	0	29	88
	203	6	0	00	40
नं. 56 कर्कुडलपटिट	20	2	0	16	93
	20	1	0	22	07
	20	3	0	02	53
	20	4	0	08	85
	20	5	0	01	36
	21	23अ	0	24	36
	21	1ब	0	13	90
	21	3	0	05	06
	21	2ब	0	00	40
	29	2	0	24	15
	29	33अ	0	22	24
	32	2ऐ	0	08	34
	32	2जे	0	09	33
	32	2हेच2	0	09	41
	32	2एन	0	07	75
	41	33अ1	0	00	84
	40	23अ	0	01	90
	40	2ब	0	20	68
	40	3ब	0	09	41
	33	5	0	03	14
	33	2	0	04	13
	40	53अ	0	15	43
	40	5ब	0	00	40
	38	7	0	04	45
	134	23अ	0	01	55
	134	2ब1	0	13	37
	134	3	0	00	40
	134	2ब3	0	31	87
	136	3ब3	0	17	90
	146	4	0	00	93
	138	3	0	22	79
	138	4	0	10	45
	956	3ब	0	21	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
	957	4	0	09	00
	950	3ब	0	13	83
	950	2अ	0	10	62
	948	4क	0	12	77
	948	4अ	0	08	79
	948	1	0	14	04
	947	8क	0	00	40
	947	6	0	10	18
	947	4	0	08	24
	946	4	0	19	51
	946	3	0	05	40
नं. 45 मुलैपल्लिपटिट	139	17	0	36	12
	139	12	0	17	28
	139	15	0	02	63
	139	11	0	00	40
	139	10	0	18	96
	158	4	0	01	82
	158	3	0	11	70
	158	1अ	0	13	13
	157	7	0	03	74
	157	8ब	0	04	54
	157	4	0	13	81
	157	8अ	0	04	36
	157	3	0	12	78
	157	1	0	01	98
	143	2अ	0	13	10
	143	1अ	0	11	80
	143	1ब	0	16	54
	142	3अ	0	11	42
	142	3ब	0	10	78
	142	2	0	15	14
	144	2	0	04	40
	142	4	0	15	13
	142	1	0	00	40
	140	11	0	02	61
	240	2अ	0	15	56
	239	3अ	0	11	57
	223	3	0	10	65

1	2	3	4	5	6
	223	8	0	00	40
	223	4ब	0	01	66
	223	6	0	09	34
	226	7अ	0	09	41
	226	5अ	0	07	58
	226	5ब	0	01	29
	226	3	0	12	62
	226	1	0	24	71
	228	3	0	20	59
	228	2	0	01	93
	228	6	0	00	58
	228	5	0	14	16
	82	23अ	0	22	87
	82	3	0	04	39
	80	4	0	10	62
	80	6	0	26	51
	79	3	0	00	55
	99	1ब	0	01	21
	98	13अ2	0	11	43
	81	1	0	08	14
	98	23अ	0	01	14
	98	1ब	0	30	23
	118	1ड	0	45	03
	118	33अ2	0	02	64
	118	33अ1	0	00	40
	118	3ब	0	06	15
	114	1ब1	0	07	49
	114	1ब2	0	05	56
	124	2	0	18	20
	123	—	0	22	97
नं. 47 नामगिरिपेट्टै	242	1ब	0	07	07
	242	3ब	0	20	02
	249	2	0	15	85
	247	—	0	22	63
	246	23अ6	0	00	40
	246	23अ5	0	15	40
	246	1ब	0	03	73
	246	23अ4	0	03	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	246	1अ	0	07	68
	245	1ब	0	03	72
	245	1अ2	0	03	72
	245	2ब	0	00	40
	245	2अ	0	07	13
	245	3अ	0	05	54
	257	6अ	0	00	40
	257	5अ	0	09	25
	257	3	0	00	95
	257	4ब	0	06	44
	257	5ब	0	05	41
	257	5क	0	01	32
	258	3	0	06	91
	258	1ड	0	03	17
	258	1इ	0	11	03
	258	2घ	0	09	18
	259	4अ	0	00	40
	259	3अ	0	01	28
	259	4घ2	0	00	40
	259	3ड	0	12	90
	259	3एफ	0	02	21
	259	4घ1	0	10	79
	261	1अ	0	10	02
	261	2अ	0	17	17
	261	2घ	0	06	81
	262	2अ	0	00	54
	262	2ब	0	10	76
	263	2अ	0	21	82
	263	2घ	0	12	56
	264	3इ	0	01	71
	264	3क	0	20	00
	264	2अ7	0	01	07
	272	1ब	0	18	17
	272	2अ	0	00	40
	272	1अ	0	04	13
	265	—	0	32	12
	266	2अ1	0	01	77
	193	2ब	0	01	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	193	2अ	0	04	37
	193	3अ	0	18	93
	193	3क	0	13	89
	189	5	0	16	01
	191	4	0	00	40
	191	3	0	08	96
	191	2	0	18	76
	191	1अ	0	00	43
	191	1ब	0	00	81
नं. 48 अरियगवुन्दनपट्टिट	244	2	0	02	28
	244	1	0	18	39
	235	1अ	0	16	47
	235	2अ	0	09	10
	234	2अ	0	17	03
	234	2ब	0	00	97
	236	—	0	34	37
	227	2	0	17	62
	226	2क2	0	21	16
	226	2क1	0	04	34
	222	2ब1	0	01	03
	222	2ब2	0	16	78
	222	2अ2	0	11	64
	295	1अ	0	11	09
	295	2अ	0	00	77
	296	4ब	0	02	29
	298	—	0	12	43
	300	2	0	19	66
	299	2	0	00	40
	299	1इ	0	07	12
	299	1क	0	04	64
	299	1अ	0	04	47
	301	2ब	0	17	42
	302	6अ	0	23	17
	302	6ब	0	04	32
	302	2ब	0	07	54
	323	2ब	0	04	96
	323	2अ	0	32	08
	323	1ब	0	05	87

1	2	3	4	5	6
	321	2ब	0	02	46
	321	2अ	0	05	94
	321	3	0	00	80
	320	1अ	0	02	11
	320	1ब	0	18	99
	318	6ब2	0	08	26
	319	—	0	18	99
	318	5	0	09	88
	318	4	0	00	45
	122	2	0	32	50
	122	1	0	09	28
	120	1	0	05	47
	118	2ब	0	44	26
	117	3	0	16	45
	117	2	0	18	15
	116	1अ	0	15	95
	116	2ब	0	10	50
	113	4अ	0	11	71
	113	4ब	0	14	80
	113	2	0	13	35
	113	3	0	04	55
	85	2	0	00	60
	85	1	0	25	46
	86	2	0	09	25
	86	3	0	01	77
	86	1	0	09	07
	87	2अ	0	04	28
	87	2ब	0	23	28
	75	2ब	0	16	65
	75	1	0	00	99
	73	1	0	19	84
	74	2	0	16	00
	74	1	0	09	36
	77	1	0	22	16
	77	2	0	05	51
	66	5	0	04	20
	66	4	0	11	28
	66	3	0	09	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66	2	0	10	76
	66	1अ	0	07	07
	64	6	0	05	30
	64	4ब	0	00	40
	64	3ब	0	05	23
	64	3अ	0	03	00
	64	2अ	0	06	60
	64	2ब	0	10	58
	56	7	0	34	70
	56	6	0	00	77
	56	1	0	14	13
	55	2	0	02	55
	52	3क	0	22	69
	52	3अ	0	05	61
	52	1अ	0	09	44
	53	3ब	0	02	91
नं 91 अ. पच्चुदेयनपालयम	9	4	0	01	41
	9	3	0	24	93
	9	2	0	11	67
	8	—	0	23	32
नं 37 वोडुवन्कुरिचि	185	4ड	0	09	16
	185	4क	0	06	43
	185	5	0	02	37
	185	4अ2	0	02	64
	185	2ब	0	06	84
	185	1ड	0	05	42
	185	1अ	0	06	82
	188	1	0	19	49
	190	—	0	29	03
	191	1	0	17	38
	80	2अ	0	09	89
	80	2ब1	0	16	04
	80	1	0	08	59
नं 49 अ. जेदारपालैयम	13	1	0	17	12
	2	1	0	20	62
	2	2अ1	0	24	48
	2	2ब	0	00	40
	4	3	0	18	72

1	2	3	4	5	6
	4	2ब	0	03	85
	4	4	0	02	72
	4	2अ	0	01	41
नं. 89 पेरमकवुन्दनपालैयम	14	2ब	0	22	03
	14	2अ	0	19	49
	18	4	0	00	51
	18	3	0	06	22
	18	2	0	06	41
	18	1अ	0	21	99
	17	1अ	0	03	25
	17	6अ	0	03	51
	17	1ब	0	00	44
	176	6ब1	0	08	74
	17	2	0	04	48
	16	5	0	00	40
	17	3अ	0	07	65
	17	3ब	0	00	63
नं. 35 थोप्पपट्टि	87	1अ	0	00	40
	87	1ब	0	23	74
	8	1	0	01	47
	8	2	0	27	60
	8	3	0	01	31
	7	7ब	0	03	62
	7	6	0	03	40
	7	5	0	04	76
	7	4	0	07	44
	7	3	0	03	75
	7	2	0	03	45
	7	1ड	0	06	38
	6	4	0	02	62
	6	5अ	0	19	80
	2	11अ	0	04	51
	2	9अ	0	04	39
	2	9ब	0	00	75
	2	8अ	0	00	66
	2	8ब	0	00	50
	2	7ब	0	00	53
	2	7अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	4	6ब	0	06	34
	4	6अ	0	02	75
	4	5	0	14	11
	4	4ब	0	03	64
	4	4अ	0	10	65
	4	1	0	09	28
	4	2	0	13	03
	4	3	0	00	72
नं. 34 सिंगलंदपुरम	146	—	0	21	20
	148	2ब	0	01	03
	148	8	0	06	55
	148	9	0	04	19
	148	3ब	0	05	41
	148	3अ	0	07	23
	148	4	0	03	90
	149	20	0	02	59
	149	19ब	0	01	68
	149	12ड	0	00	40
	149	14	0	03	64
	149	13	0	02	22
	149	12अ	0	01	65
	149	10	0	14	37
	149	9	0	01	25
	149	7ब	0	11	50
	149	8	0	00	57
	157	—	0	00	64
	149	7अ	0	07	81
	149	6	0	03	04
	150	19	0	15	82
	150	17	0	00	47
	150	15एन	0	00	50
	150	18	0	09	29
	151	6एफ	0	14	46
	151	5ब	0	00	40
	151	5अ	0	00	40
	151	6ड	0	03	63
	151	6इ	0	03	42
	151	6क	0	09	53

1	2	3	4	5	6
	151	7	0	00	42
	151	6ब	0	08	40
	151	6अ	0	00	40
	202	3ब1ड	0	37	34
	202	3अ2	0	13	88
	202	1	0	06	35
	205	5ब	0	00	40
	205	5अ	0	03	90
	205	3	0	10	82
	205	4ब	0	04	25
	206	1क	0	02	96
	206	4	0	06	79
	211	1	0	06	88
	207	3	0	06	08
	207	2	0	24	86
	208	2अ	0	14	07
	34	2ब	0	22	72
	34	2अ	0	11	75
	35	4अ	0	00	89
	35	3	0	10	38
	35	2	0	00	86
	32	2	0	28	80
	24	2अ1	0	59	76
	24	2ब	0	13	27
	9	5	0	05	00
	9	4	0	08	91
	9	3	0	10	78
	9	2	0	03	16
	9	1अ	0	07	95
	9	1ब	0	00	40
	8	6	0	26	10
	7	3	0	25	09
	6	1	0	04	84
	6	3	0	20	58
	6	2	0	00	40
	12	1	0	19	33
	12	4	0	00	58
नं. 21 काक्कावेरि	218	2हेच	0	00	63
	218	2जि	0	03	24
	218	2एफ	0	09	00
	218	2इ	0	07	38
	218	2क	0	13	50
	218	2अ	0	10	08

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 23 रासिपुरम	502	2इ	0	04	82
	502	2एफ	0	02	55
	502	2ड	0	04	86
	502	2अ	0	17	35
	502	2ब	0	00	40
	503	1	0	32	37
	508	6	0	12	12
	508	9	0	00	40
	508	5	0	08	58
	509	2	0	15	84
	513	2अ	0	00	70
	514	2अ	0	20	35
	533	9	0	04	15
	533	7	0	06	33
	530	20	0	07	42
	530	16	0	14	95
	479	—	0	11	35
	476	3	0	02	22
	476	4	0	20	15
	476	6क	0	02	93
	476	5	0	00	40
	476	6ब	0	13	23
	474	—	0	22	27
	453	14	0	03	44
	453	13	0	06	09
	453	11अ	0	06	13
	453	11ब	0	05	86
	453	10	0	00	40
	453	3	0	00	59
	453	5	0	00	76
	453	4	0	04	11
	453	25	0	03	08
	453	13अ	0	00	40
	452	9	0	00	59
	452	6	0	01	13
	452	11	0	03	66
	449	4	0	03	57
	449	5	0	05	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
	445	7अ	0	07	80
	445	7ब	0	07	07
	447	1ब	0	06	20
	447	7	0	12	06
	447	15	0	00	60
नं 25/1 चंद्रशेकरपुरम	510	2	0	30	39
	514	4	0	10	01
	514	3	0	09	45
	37	12	0	01	77
	37	11	0	00	40
	37	13	0	11	59
	484	2	0	18	12
	541	2	0	14	28
	542	3	0	14	90
	542	4	0	17	93
	543	1	0	11	50
	455	22	0	06	76
	455	21	0	00	80
	452	18अ	0	05	44
	452	15	0	04	18
	452	14	0	04	99
	446	5अ	0	20	27
	446	5क	0	02	22
	538	7अ	0	00	85
	538	2	0	05	84
	538	12	0	02	69
	538	10	0	04	85
	538	13	0	06	24
	539	5	0	11	16
	539	1	0	02	40
	539	4	0	05	13
नं 32 मुरुगपट्टि	2	1अ	0	00	72
	2	3ब1	0	01	62
	2	1ब1	0	11	34
	1	1अ	0	00	90
	1	1ब	0	08	46
नं 26 अनैपालयम	112	2ब	0	06	76
	112	2अ	0	09	14
	112	1ब	0	10	24
	112	1क	0	04	53

1	2	3	4	5	6
	113	3	0	05	78
	113	2ब	0	07	46
	113	23अ	0	00	40
	102	7ब	0	01	80
	102	9अ	0	09	08
	102	103अ	0	11	00
	102	8अ	0	00	91
	102	5	0	04	87
	102	4	0	05	60
	102	1	0	02	87
	103	2	0	34	67
	103	1	0	00	42
	46	7	0	15	09
	98	13अ	0	05	30
	46	9	0	00	40
	98	2	0	00	40
	47	3	0	10	76
	47	2	0	08	88
	47	4	0	11	25
	47	1	0	02	11
	94	2	0	03	72
	94	1	0	11	87
	49	6	0	14	54
	49	1	0	05	22
	49	2	0	21	58
	50	3	0	00	50
	50	2	0	13	55
	50	13अ	0	06	34
	51	33अ	0	13	78
	51	3ब	0	01	73
	51	2	0	21	20
	52	1	0	01	54
	51	1	0	00	74
	53	13अ	0	15	28
	53	1ब	0	20	65
	54	2	0	00	95
नं. 27 कुरुकापुरम	51	1ब	0	21	08
	51	13अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66	4	0	04	75
	67	3क	0	00	40
	67	3ब	0	13	56
	67	3अ	0	09	08
	73	4क	0	03	44
	73	4ड	0	14	05
	74	4	0	19	58
	74	3	0	02	31
	76	—	0	19	59
	61	5	0	01	17
	77	—	0	21	47
	78	5	0	00	40
	78	4	0	01	18
	78	1	0	16	48
	80	2अ2	0	24	09
	81	7	0	19	72
	81	6	0	06	98
	81	5	0	11	58
	86	2	0	17	63
	86	4	0	13	56
	85	1ब	0	01	72
	85	1अ2	0	31	82
नं. 83 एल्लपालयम	36	5	0	13	09
	36	3	0	00	82
	36	2	0	14	38
	35	1ड	0	03	70
	35	1क	0	00	40
	34	2के	0	02	59
	34	2हेच	0	12	82
	34	2जि	0	06	81
	34	2एफ	0	06	56
	34	2अ	0	02	66
	34	1	0	09	25
	26	3	0	02	46
	26	1ब	0	09	71
	26	1अ2	0	00	40
	17	4अ	0	00	40
	17	3ब	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	17	3अ	0	09	15
	11	2क	0	00	46
	11	2अ	0	22	12
	12	2क	0	04	91
	13	8	0	03	65
	13	7	0	15	30
	13	3	0	05	47
	13	1	0	02	57
	13	2	0	07	63
	14	1ब	0	02	19
	14	13अ	0	00	40
नं. 29 पिल्लानल्लूर	103	6	0	11	23
	103	5	0	27	47
	102	6एफ	0	19	40
	104	1	0	06	38
	101	2क	0	01	48
	101	2अ	0	11	39
	98	3	0	07	33
	98	5	0	00	40
	98	4	0	01	10
	52	5ब	0	27	91
	52	5अ	0	01	40
	53	9अ	0	20	50
	53	9ब	0	02	00
	53	10	0	01	56
	60	2एफ	0	12	01
	60	2ड	0	16	69
	60	2इ	0	01	16
	60	2अ	0	00	66
	60	2ब	0	06	68
	60	1	0	20	88
	63	6ब	0	01	36
	64	2	0	13	04
	63	6अ	0	03	68
	63	4ब	0	01	00
	64	1	0	08	10
नं. 30 पोन्कुरिचि	34	9अ	0	09	80
	34	9ब	0	07	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	34	6ब1	0	05	14
	34	6अ	0	06	48
	34	4ब	0	04	55
	34	5	0	01	35
	34	4अ	0	07	24
	32	9	0	19	53
	30	2क	0	11	25
	30	5ब	0	02	07
	30	5अ	0	05	32
	30	2ब	0	08	72
	30	2अ	0	06	12
	29	3अ	0	09	90
	29	2	0	02	34
	29	3ब	0	12	60
	29	3क	0	03	60
	29	4अ	0	04	68
	28	14हेच	0	05	04
	28	14ऐ	0	01	80
	28	14एफ	0	01	21
	28	14क	0	00	84
	28	14ड	0	06	41
	28	12	0	00	40
	28	10	0	05	44
	28	9	0	04	29
	28	8	0	00	40
	28	2	0	05	71
	28	3	0	02	53
	27	2क	0	09	86
	27	2ब	0	10	80

तालुका : तिरुचेंगोडु		जिला : नामक्कल		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 87 कल्लुपालेयम	29	1	0	00	80
	29	2अ	0	09	90
	29	3	0	10	44
	29	4	0	10	08
	30	4	0	13	68
	30	2	0	07	20
	52	1	0	09	72
	52	2	0	29	16
	48	4ब	0	12	60
	48	2	0	03	78
	50	13अ	0	17	10
	49	2ब	0	08	86
	49	1ब	0	02	76
	49	13अ	0	06	81
	63	1ब4	0	12	29
	63	1ब3	0	01	14
	63	13अ	0	06	72
	74	1ब	0	08	45
	75	2ब	0	06	20
	75	1क2	0	00	40
	75	1क3	0	08	53
	75	1ब	0	12	07
	75	1क1	0	02	19
	77	1	0	06	15
	78	2अ	0	21	57
	79	13अ	0	45	68
नं. 86 मुजनूर	185	2	0	17	60
	185	1	0	15	13
	184	2	0	17	29
	183	3	0	17	99
	183	1	0	06	18
	210	—	0	15	67

1	2	3	4	5	6
	212	2	0	11	70
	212	3ड	0	15	06
	212	3एफ	0	00	40
	212	3इ	0	13	43
	212	3क	0	00	46
	233	2	0	22	61
	215	2अ	0	44	04
	216	2क	0	00	40
	217	1ब	0	30	10
	217	1अ	0	01	77
	218	1ब	0	00	85
	218	1अ	0	30	37
	219	4	0	11	64
	202	2ब3	0	09	60
	202	2ब4	0	05	73
	202	2अ	0	15	19
नं. 88 मिन्नपल्ली	61	2	0	25	21
	66	1अ	0	02	33
	64	5	0	12	91
	64	4	0	01	00
	70	1ब	0	00	78
	70	1अ	0	10	34
नं. 84 मोरंगाम	100	1	0	08	61
	99	—	0	32	32
	90	1ड	0	12	77
	90	1क	0	10	45
	90	1अ	0	05	52
	83	—	0	34	20
	85	2	0	37	09
	78	2	0	15	00
	78	1	0	00	49
	77	2	0	20	50
	76	—	0	06	32
	37	—	0	26	59
	38	—	0	06	37
	35	4	0	27	67
	36	6अ	0	21	00
	36	5	0	36	56

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 92 करुगलपट्टि	68	1	0	37	92
	40	1ड	0	12	98
	40	1ब	0	02	01
	40	1अ	0	06	23
	39	2अ	0	16	27
	43	1ब	0	26	80
	43	3	0	02	37
	43	4	0	11	58
	46	2क	0	32	05
	46	2ड	0	01	15
	48	4ब	0	00	41
	48	3इ	0	01	18
	48	3ड	0	10	21
	48	4अ	0	21	12
	48	3क	0	03	33
	51	4	0	30	13
	51	5	0	10	02
	53	1ब	0	02	96
	25	2अ	0	04	93
	25	1अ	0	18	70
	22	17क	0	12	74
	22	9ड	0	00	53
	22	7क	0	00	40
	22	7ब	0	00	40
	22	7अ	0	00	53
	22	17ब	0	00	52
	22	17अ	0	07	04
	22	2	0	06	72
	29	1	0	02	46
	29	2	0	00	40
	76	6	0	08	55
	29	3	0	00	89
	77	—	0	43	10
नं. 93 परुटिपल्लि	218	2	0	12	20
	218	5	0	03	36
	218	4	0	05	19
	213	4	0	02	57
	213	3	0	04	79

1	2	3	4	5	6
	219	1	0	07	56
	213	1	0	09	19
	219	7	0	00	40
	211	—	0	30	90
	207	2ब	0	02	50
	207	1ब	0	01	71
	207	23अ	0	02	65
	207	13अ	0	02	50
	196	13	0	02	46
	196	12	0	04	50
	196	8	0	03	42
	196	7	0	01	17
	196	6	0	01	50
	196	5	0	01	21
	196	3	0	01	80
	196	2	0	02	09
	196	1	0	01	86
	194	3	0	02	47
	191	7ब	0	12	47
	191	73अ	0	13	63
	191	4	0	02	77
	191	3	0	01	59
	191	2	0	07	40
	190	2	0	01	13
	190	1	0	02	22
	188	5	0	02	59
	188	4	0	02	57
	188	3	0	02	59
	188	2	0	13	92
	187	4	0	06	24
	187	3	0	05	81
	187	2	0	04	35
	183	4	0	03	94
	183	3	0	05	52
	183	1	0	02	43
	182	9	0	01	97
	182	10	0	01	02
	182	11	0	01	41

1	2	3	4	5	6
	182	8	0	00	40
	182	12	0	01	54
	182	13	0	05	02
	182	4	0	00	99
	182	3	0	00	46
	182	15	0	01	93
	181	6	0	00	60
	180	3	0	10	91
	180	2	0	05	00
	179	2	0	08	96
	175	3	0	08	57
	175	4	0	00	40
	175	2	0	00	64
	175	1	0	16	34
	170	7	0	06	54
	170	6	0	07	18
	170	1	0	05	50
	170	3	0	00	40
	150	13अ	0	10	36
	171	19	0	00	91
	171	14क	0	00	40
	110	1ब	0	28	31
	110	1क	0	04	38
	110	13अ	0	17	28
	110	1ड	0	01	26
	110	2	0	01	82
	105	2	0	04	71
	105	1	0	04	74
	104	5अ	0	06	96
	104	2	0	11	53
	93	3क	0	00	54
	93	3ब	0	12	43
	93	33अ	0	00	61
	93	1ब	0	07	31
	93	13अ	0	09	79
	92	13अ	0	40	31
	92	2	0	04	10
	76	7	0	10	41

1	2	3	4	5	6
	76	6	0	13	09
	77	4	0	05	60
	77	3	0	06	31
	77	2	0	09	02
	77	5	0	05	00
	78	3	0	05	08
	86	3	0	00	40
	78	2	0	10	63
	78	13अ	0	15	11
	79	15एफ	0	00	40
	79	15ब	0	02	18
	79	15जि	0	03	96
	79	15ऐ	0	00	40
	79	15हेच	0	02	28
	79	7	0	02	73
	79	8	0	02	71
	79	9	0	02	37
	79	10	0	07	17
	79	11	0	00	40
	80	17जे	0	01	09
	54	5	0	05	47
	53	8	0	00	40
	54	8	0	03	69
	54	4	0	00	40
	54	3	0	07	18
	54	2	0	00	50
	54	1	0	00	95
	52	20	0	00	47
	54	11	0	42	77
	56	—	0	21	29
	58	2	0	19	03
	81	9	0	10	51
	81	5	0	13	97
	81	4	0	07	94
	81	1	0	06	24
	87	7	0	19	98
	87	8	0	00	40
	87	2	0	15	92

नं. 94 रामापुरम

1	2	3	4	5	6
	87	3	0	07	48
	72	18	0	00	76
	72	21	0	03	25
	72	20	0	02	96
	72	13ड	0	06	35
	72	12	0	06	18
	74	1	0	04	88
	73	18	0	07	61
	73	10	0	03	64
	73	9	0	06	34
	73	8	0	08	77
	65	4	0	10	05
	65	3	0	10	79
	58	2ब	0	33	76
	58	2अ	0	03	89
	58	1	0	16	91
	61	2	0	14	29
	60	8	0	28	56
	53	2	0	28	36
	52	1	0	28	83
	51	3	0	05	76
	51	2	0	03	24
	45	2इ	0	09	00
	45	2अ	0	11	22
	46	3	0	32	84
नं. 68 वट्टूर	308	3	0	19	24
	307	—	0	27	37
	306	—	0	23	52
	305	2	0	04	36
	305	1	0	01	24
	304	1क	0	02	87
	304	1अ1	0	14	94
	254	4अ1	0	02	74
	254	3	0	05	75
	254	2	0	12	60
	252	3	0	23	49
	252	2	0	05	49

1	2	3	4	5	6
	233	1	0	24	52
	221	1	0	23	27
	222	—	0	45	55
	224	2	0	39	40
	219	—	0	01	14
	217	2ऐ	0	23	94
	217	2ब	0	10	04
	217	1ब	0	14	79
	20	13अ2	0	01	13
	20	13अ1	0	28	09
	22	13अ	0	23	94
	18	3	0	24	27
	24	1ब	0	11	55
	24	13अ	0	26	83
	25	1	0	09	82
	161	—	0	09	24
	160	2	0	46	61
	44	1	0	34	83
	44	53अ	0	00	40
	33	8	0	08	87
	33	93अ	0	00	40
	33	7ब	0	18	46
	33	7क	0	00	58
	33	7अ	0	00	55
	33	7इ	0	07	33
	33	5	0	08	72
	33	4	0	05	00
	33	3अ	0	00	97
	33	1अ	0	01	63
नं. 69 पिल्लनत्थम	69	2क	0	08	58
	69	2ब	0	25	72
	68	3	0	07	44
	68	17	0	02	05
	68	18	0	10	18
	68	15	0	00	58
	68	14	0	06	20
	66	5ब	0	12	37
	66	5अ	0	15	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	65	2हेच	0	04	63
	65	2एफ	0	25	41
	65	2जि	0	03	68
	65	2ब	0	02	88
न 50 करुगापुरम	232	4	0	00	40
	232	5	0	09	46
	232	2ब	0	06	10
	232	1ब	0	05	45
	231	1ब	0	08	43
	231	4ब	0	00	40
	231	13अ	0	06	65
	231	43अ	0	02	87
	231	33अ	0	00	96
	230	1	0	11	67
	229	2	0	00	40
	229	33अ1	0	37	39
	228	1ब2	0	06	12
	228	1ब1	0	03	69
	227	3ब	0	00	40
	213	23अ	0	20	42
	213	3	0	15	03
	213	4	0	09	10
	55	1ब	0	09	72
	53	5	0	23	85
	52	6ब	0	00	77
	52	63अ	0	11	47
	52	23अ	0	03	84
	52	1	0	09	13
	45	—	0	47	63
	44	3	0	03	72
	41	1क	0	01	19
	41	1ब	0	14	74
	40	1ब	0	14	92
	37	1क	0	22	13
	37	1ब	0	14	09
	37	13अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 51 तिरुमंगलम	15	1	0	30	48
	17	7	0	22	90
	17	3	0	08	41
	19	3	0	21	93
	19	2	0	07	84
	19	1	0	16	04
	20	2	0	10	71
	20	3अ	0	00	40
	30	3	0	16	76
	30	4अ	0	00	40
	29	1	0	20	80
	30	2अ	0	00	86
	30	1	0	02	63
	34	1अ	0	13	56
	34	1ब	0	00	40
	42	5	0	06	30
	42	4	0	11	74
	42	3	0	01	27
	42	1	0	00	49
	43	2ब3	0	00	40
	43	2ब2इ	0	01	15
	43	2ब1	0	05	17
	43	2अ	0	06	09
	43	1ब	0	09	07
	45	2ब	0	12	22
	47	2क	0	12	95
	47	2ब	0	00	40
	47	1	0	37	46
नं. 52 करुप्पगवुंदमपाल्यम	14	13	0	01	07
	14	1ब	0	15	61
	16	2ब1	0	03	28
	16	1	0	14	91
	17	2	0	10	70
	17	1	0	04	96
	18	—	0	16	30
	19	6	0	23	28
	19	5	0	00	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
	19	43A	0	07	92
	19	3	0	00	40
	19	2	0	05	10
	21	4	0	05	40
नं. 49 राजपाल्यम	185	3	0	18	45
	186	1	0	13	66
	178	3ब	0	21	90
	185	1	0	00	40
	183	2एफ	0	00	40
	178	3A1	0	05	06
	183	2ब	0	00	42
	183	3	0	19	78
	178	13A1	0	00	84
	180	1	0	04	54

[फा. सं. आर-25011/15/2004-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

s.O.1737.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited;

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 4/2, Arockiasamy Street, Crawford Colony, Tiruchirappalli-620 012, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Tuk : Rasipuram		District : Namakkal		State : Tamil Nadu		
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area			
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
NO.61 THIMMANAYAKKANPATTI	226	1A	0	13	09	
	226	1B	0	13	64	
	227	1	0	01	00	
	227	2	0	20	67	
	224	3B	0	14	87	
	224	2	0	24	26	
	203	2C1	0	09	76	
	203	2E	0	07	65	
	203	2C2	0	00	58	
	202	2	0	20	33	
	201	4	0	11	55	
	201	5	0	12	82	
	201	2	0	02	43	
	180	1	0	02	03	
	180	2	0	27	83	
	180	3A	0	00	40	
	169	4	0	19	77	
	169	2	0	13	80	
	169	3	0	03	13	
	158	15	0	06	82	
	158	11	0	02	40	
	158	13	0	07	22	
	158	14	0	02	97	
	158	12	0	04	79	
	160	3	0	20	99	
	160	2D	0	09	71	
	160	2C	0	08	02	
	161	2C	0	02	34	
	161	2B	0	20	16	
	161	2A2	0	10	80	
	148	3	0	08	62	
	148	1A	0	07	93	
	149	2	0	11	52	

1	2	3	4	5	6
	149	4	0	09	05
	149	1B	0	22	22
	149	1A	0	01	79
	144	2	0	17	64
	144	1	0	13	06
	138	5	0	11	15
	138	3	0	03	87
	139	3	0	04	15
	139	2	0	07	75
	139	1C	0	05	96
No.60 ESWARAMURTHIPALAYAM	161	2F	0	00	95
	161	2G	0	00	45
	161	2E	0	18	01
	161	2B	0	00	49
	161	2C	0	19	54
	161	2D	0	01	14
	161	1	0	10	22
	150	2B3	0	28	58
	150	2B4	0	02	03
	150	3D	0	05	60
	150	3C	0	01	58
	150	3B	0	00	67
	150	3A	0	00	60
	143	5	0	00	40
	146	2B	0	34	33
	146	2E	0	00	92
	146	2D	0	00	54
	146	2C	0	01	18
	146	2F	0	07	31
	146	2G	0	00	40
	146	2A	0	04	39
	145	7	0	14	35
	146	1	0	01	03
	182	3	0	20	22
	182	1	0	09	86
	183	5	0	10	25
	183	6	0	07	05
	183	7A	0	10	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	186	5	0	08	52
	186	2	0	08	34
	186	1B	0	10	48
	187	2	0	03	49
	187	1D	0	10	74
	188	4B	0	05	09
	188	4E	0	03	91
	188	4D	0	11	28
	188	4C	0	06	77
	188	5C	0	06	84
	196	9	0	01	70
	112	2H	0	08	88
	196	9	0	00	40
	196	1A	0	14	78
	196	3	0	06	65
	196	2B	0	15	60
	197	3B	0	03	70
	197	3A	0	01	10
	196	2A	0	00	40
	197	2A	0	03	63
	197	2B	0	00	47
	197	2C	0	00	40
	197	1G	0	02	01
	197	1A	0	01	19
	197	1F	0	01	22
	197	1E	0	08	47
	197	1D	0	17	12
	198	1	0	00	40
	199	5	0	16	51
	205	1A	0	18	01
	205	1B	0	00	40
	206	3	0	13	45
	206	4A	0	07	17
	209	1E	0	00	40
	209	1F	0	08	24
	209	4B	0	06	15
	209	4C	0	02	15
	209	3B	0	03	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	209	3C	0	04	84
	210	7	0	00	40
	210	6A	0	08	07
	209	2	0	02	28
	60	3B	0	06	84
	58	4	0	14	88
	58	3	0	00	40
	58	5	0	13	43
	58	2D	0	03	23
	58	1A	0	00	58
	58	6C	0	03	43
	58	2A	0	00	40
	58	6B	0	03	61
	58	6A	0	02	86
	58	7	0	05	30
	58	1C	0	00	40
	57	3E	0	01	75
	57	3F	0	00	74
	57	3D	0	08	83
	57	3C	0	01	88
	57	4A	0	00	86
	56	4B	0	12	51
	56	4C	0	06	39
	56	4D	0	01	89
	55	3	0	02	52
	55	2B	0	05	48
	55	2A	0	00	40
	55	2C	0	00	91
	56	3	0	10	40
	56	2	0	13	56
	233	1	0	04	19
	35	1F	0	12	25
	35	1G	0	10	97
	35	2B	0	18	20
	237	3	0	00	40
	237	2	0	03	86
	237	1D	0	02	24
	237	1E	0	10	81
	237	5B	0	04	82
	237	5A	0	00	98
	239	9B	0	01	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	239	9A	0	04	53
	238	1B	0	10	34
	238	1A	0	10	77
	240	5	0	05	20
	240	4	0	05	87
	240	3A	0	05	53
	240	2	0	07	64
	253	1F	0	07	21
	253	1E	0	07	14
	255	4D	0	00	92
	255	4C	0	08	37
	255	4A	0	10	29
	256	3	0	08	79
	256	4	0	01	21
	256	2F	0	11	50
	256	2D	0	08	45
	258	4A	0	00	40
	258	3A	0	03	00
	258	2B	0	00	40
	258	4B	0	00	40
	258	3B	0	01	96
	258	2C	0	01	78
	258	2A	0	02	29
	258	1	0	03	60
NO. 59 MANGALAPURAM	71	2	0	11	87
	71	1	0	08	90
	72	8	0	00	40
	71	3	0	00	40
	72	11	0	05	90
	72	8	0	00	40
	72	10	0	07	30
	72	9	0	05	48
	71	4	0	15	56
	71	5	0	04	33
	73	4B	0	10	34
	73	4A	0	00	40
	78	2A	0	00	71
	78	1	0	11	27

1	2	3	4	5	6
	77	2	0	01	47
	77	1	0	00	40
	77	3	0	05	79
	77	4	0	06	07
	77	6A	0	10	85
	77	7	0	01	62
	77	10	0	13	88
	84	7	0	01	96
	84	6	0	06	33
	84	8	0	08	90
	84	9	0	10	20
	85	2	0	09	47
	85	1	0	07	96
	85	3	0	00	40
	88	3A	0	10	94
	88	2B	0	20	28
	87	4B2	0	00	40
	88	1	0	06	45
	237	2B	0	08	67
	237	4	0	00	40
	237	3C	0	00	45
	237	3B	0	09	51
	237	3A	0	01	70
	238	2	0	12	19
	238	1A	0	00	40
	238	1B	0	11	23
	235	3C	0	00	40
	235	9	0	06	28
	235	4A	0	02	51
	235	4B	0	08	63
	235	7C	0	00	50
	235	7A	0	06	05
	235	6	0	16	16
	235	5	0	03	77
	226	1	0	10	01
	230	4A	0	05	58
	230	4B	0	07	75
	230	4C	0	04	04

1	2	3	4	5	6
	230	4D	0	02	33
	229	1A	0	00	40
	230	3	0	05	15
	229	3	0	01	29
	230	2D	0	00	85
	229	2	0	03	13
	229	1B	0	03	71
	230	8	0	11	89
	230	5B1	0	06	71
	230	5A	0	01	07
	163	1A	0	25	11
	163	1B	0	00	64
	164	1B	0	05	68
	165	10B	0	07	94
	161	4D	0	00	42
	161	4C	0	00	40
	165	7C	0	02	73
	165	10C	0	03	77
	165	7B	0	08	49
	165	10A	0	01	70
	165	10E	0	02	75
	165	7A	0	08	20
	165	10F	0	01	23
	165	3A	0	01	99
	165	3F	0	02	70
	165	3E	0	04	28
	166	1	0	21	97
	165	5B	0	00	85
	166	4A	0	10	12
	157	7	0	01	09
	157	5A	0	13	89
	157	5D	0	08	20
	156	2	0	09	63
	157	5C	0	00	63
	156	10B	0	03	12
	156	3	0	01	49
	156	4	0	03	40
	156	5	0	03	14
	156	6	0	00	94

1	2	3	4	5	6
	155	13C	0	10	00
	155	13B	0	02	47
	155	11	0	10	69
	155	9	0	01	51
	153	1A	0	11	02
	153	1B	0	09	23
	153	7C	0	01	61
	176	3	0	00	60
	176	4	0	06	69
	176	5	0	07	97
	176	2	0	00	40
	176	6D	0	10	21
	176	6C	0	12	65
	177	6D	0	06	51
	178	4C	0	02	83
	178	4B	0	08	34
	178	4G	0	03	62
	178	1	0	04	43
	178	2	0	05	88
NO.58 NAVALPATTI	149	3	0	01	95
	149	2E	0	06	35
	153	1C	0	06	13
	149	2C	0	13	11
	153	1B	0	15	95
	153	3	0	02	14
NO. 57 AYILPATTI	81	1A	0	06	26
	81	2A1	0	18	77
	81	2B	0	00	86
	80	2B2	0	27	70
	74	2	0	06	65
	74	3	0	35	22
	73	4	0	04	80
	73	5A	0	15	26
	71	1B	0	00	40
	71	1C	0	22	70
	72	1	0	01	00
	71	2	0	08	55

1	2	3	4	5	6
	108	1B	0	00	40
	108	1A	0	18	36
	108	2	0	08	52
	112	3	0	03	36
	112	7B	0	12	96
	112	7A	0	06	48
	112	6	0	11	16
	115	4	0	10	26
	119	1B2	0	17	10
	119	2B	0	10	61
	119	3A	0	09	53
	119	3C	0	00	40
	119	3B	0	08	37
	119	5B	0	13	05
	123	3C	0	08	61
	123	3E	0	06	39
	123	3D	0	01	40
	125	2A	0	01	08
	125	2B	0	20	51
	135	1	0	16	91
	126	2	0	00	40
	135	3	0	13	01
	135	4	0	00	40
	135	5	0	01	31
	135	8	0	17	18
	135	7	0	00	40
	132	1	0	22	23
	132	2	0	08	82
	133	1C	0	00	40
	133	2	0	22	80
	177	1A1	0	28	07
	177	1A2	0	10	17
	177	1A3	0	16	99
	177	1B	0	01	24

1	2	3	4	5	6
	179	1B	0	15	28
	179	1D	0	14	98
	179	2	0	29	88
	203	6	0	00	40
NO. 56 KARKUDALPATTI	20	2	0	16	93
	20	1	0	22	07
	20	3	0	02	53
	20	4	0	08	85
	20	5	0	01	36
	21	2A	0	24	36
	21	1B	0	13	90
	21	3	0	05	06
	21	2B	0	00	40
	29	2	0	24	15
	29	3A	0	22	24
	32	2I	0	08	34
	32	2J	0	09	33
	32	2H2	0	09	41
	32	2N	0	07	75
	41	3A1	0	00	84
	40	2A	0	01	90
	40	2B	0	20	68
	40	3B	0	09	41
	33	5	0	03	14
	33	2	0	04	13
	40	5A	0	15	43
	40	5B	0	00	40
	38	7	0	04	45
	134	2A	0	01	55
	134	2B1	0	13	37
	134	3	0	00	40
	134	2B3	0	31	87
	136	3B3	0	17	90
	146	4	0	00	93
	138	3	0	22	79
	138	4	0	10	45
	956	3B	0	21	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
	957	4	0	09	00
	950	3B	0	13	83
	950	2A	0	10	62
	948	4C	0	12	77
	948	4A	0	08	79
	948	1	0	14	04
	947	8C	0	00	40
	947	6	0	10	18
	947	4	0	08	24
	946	4	0	19	51
	946	3	0	05	40
NO45. MULAIPALLIPATTI	139	17	0	36	12
	139	12	0	17	28
	139	15	0	02	63
	139	11	0	00	40
	139	10	0	18	96
	158	4	0	01	82
	158	3	0	11	70
	158	1A	0	13	13
	157	7	0	03	74
	157	8B	0	04	54
	157	4	0	13	81
	157	8A	0	04	36
	157	3	0	12	78
	157	1	0	01	98
	143	2A	0	13	10
	143	1A	0	11	80
	143	1B	0	16	54
	142	3A	0	11	42
	142	3B	0	10	78
	142	2	0	15	14
	144	2	0	04	40
	142	4	0	15	13
	142	1	0	00	40
	140	11	0	02	61
	240	2A	0	15	56
	239	3A	0	11	57
	223	3	0	10	65

1	2	3	4	5	6
	223	8	0	00	40
	223	4B	0	01	66
	223	6	0	09	34
	226	7A	0	09	41
	226	5A	0	07	58
	226	5B	0	01	29
	226	3	0	12	62
	226	1	0	24	71
	228	3	0	20	59
	228	2	0	01	93
	228	6	0	00	58
	228	5	0	14	16
	82	2A	0	22	87
	82	3	0	04	39
	80	4	0	10	62
	80	6	0	26	51
	79	3	0	00	55
	99	1B	0	01	21
	98	1A2	0	11	43
	81	1	0	08	14
	98	2A	0	01	14
	98	1B	0	30	23
	118	1D	0	45	03
	118	3A2	0	02	64
	118	3A1	0	00	40
	118	3B	0	06	15
	114	1B1	0	07	49
	114	1B2	0	05	56
	124	2	0	18	20
	123	-	0	22	97
NO. 47 NAMAGIRIPETTAI	242	1B	0	07	07
	242	3B	0	20	02
	249	2	0	15	85
	247	-	0	22	63
	246	2A6	0	00	40
	246	2A5	0	15	40
	246	1B	0	03	73
	246	2A4	0	03	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	246	1A	0	07	68
	245	1B	0	03	72
	245	1A2	0	03	72
	245	2B	0	00	40
	245	2A	0	07	13
	245	3A	0	05	54
	257	6A	0	00	40
	257	5A	0	09	25
	257	3	0	00	95
	257	4B	0	06	44
	257	5B	0	05	41
	257	5C	0	01	32
	258	3	0	06	91
	258	1D	0	03	17
	258	1E	0	11	03
	258	2B	0	09	18
	259	4A	0	00	40
	259	3A	0	01	28
	259	4B2	0	00	40
	259	3D	0	12	90
	259	3F	0	02	21
	259	4B1	0	10	79
	261	1A	0	10	02
	261	2A	0	17	17
	261	2B	0	06	81
	262	2A	0	00	54
	262	2B	0	10	76
	263	2A	0	21	82
	263	2B	0	12	56
	264	3E	0	01	71
	264	3C	0	20	00
	264	2A7	0	01	07
	272	1B	0	18	17
	272	2A	0	00	40
	272	1A	0	04	13
	265	-	0	32	12
	266	2A1	0	01	77
	193	2B	0	01	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	193	2A	0	04	37
	193	3A	0	18	93
	193	3C	0	13	89
	189	5	0	16	01
	191	4	0	00	40
	191	3	0	08	96
	191	2	0	18	76
	191	1A	0	00	43
	191	1B	0	00	81
NO. 191 YAGOUNDANPATTI	244	2	0	02	28
	244	1	0	18	39
	235	1A	0	16	47
	235	2A	0	09	10
	234	2A	0	17	03
	234	2B	0	00	97
	236	-	0	34	37
	227	2	0	17	62
	226	2C2	0	21	16
	226	2C1	0	04	34
	222	2B1	0	01	03
	222	2B2	0	16	78
	222	2A2	0	11	64
	295	1A	0	11	09
	295	2A	0	00	77
	296	4B	0	02	29
	298	-	0	12	43
	300	2	0	19	66
	299	2	0	00	40
	299	1E	0	07	12
	299	1C	0	04	64
	299	1A	0	04	47
	301	2B	0	17	42
	302	6A	0	23	17
	302	6B	0	04	32
	302	2B	0	07	54
	323	2B	0	04	96
	323	2A	0	32	08
	323	1B	0	05	87

1	2	3	4	5	6
	321	2B	0	02	46
	321	2A	0	05	94
	321	3	0	00	80
	320	1A	0	02	11
	320	1B	0	18	99
	318	6B2	0	08	26
	319	-	0	18	99
	318	5	0	09	88
	318	4	0	00	45
	122	2	0	32	50
	122	1	0	09	28
	120	1	0	05	47
	118	2B	0	44	26
	117	3	0	16	45
	117	2	0	18	15
	116	1A	0	15	95
	116	2B	0	10	50
	113	4A	0	11	71
	113	4B	0	14	80
	113	2	0	13	35
	113	3	0	04	55
	85	2	0	00	60
	85	1	0	25	46
	86	2	0	09	25
	86	3	0	01	77
	86	1	0	09	07
	87	2A	0	04	28
	87	2B	0	23	28
	75	2B	0	16	65
	75	1	0	00	99
	73	1	0	19	84
	74	2	0	16	00
	74	1	0	09	36
	77	1	0	22	16
	77	2	0	05	51
	66	5	0	04	20
	66	4	0	11	28
	66	3	0	09	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66	2	0	10	76
	66	1A	0	07	07
	64	6	0	05	30
	64	4B	0	00	40
	64	3B	0	05	23
	64	3A	0	03	00
	64	2A	0	06	60
	64	2B	0	10	58
	56	7	0	34	70
	56	6	0	00	77
	56	1	0	14	13
	55	2	0	02	55
	52	3C	0	22	69
	52	3A	0	05	61
	52	1A	0	09	44
	53	3B	0	02	91
NO.91.O. PACHUDAYAMPALAYAM	9	4	0	01	41
	9	3	0	24	93
	9	2	0	11	67
	8	-	0	23	32
NO.37 ODUVANKURICHI	185	4D	0	09	16
	185	4C	0	06	43
	185	5	0	02	37
	185	4A2	0	02	64
	185	2B	0	06	84
	185	1D	0	05	42
	185	1A	0	06	82
	188	1	0	19	49
	190	-	0	29	03
	191	1	0	17	38
	80	2A	0	09	89
	80	2B1	0	16	04
	80	1	0	08	59
NO.49 O.JEDARPALAYAM	13	1	0	17	12
	2	1	0	20	62
	2	2A1	0	24	48
	2	2B	0	00	40
	4	3	0	18	72

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.89 PERUMAGOUNDEMPALAYAM	4	2B	0	03	85
	4	4	0	02	72
	4	2A	0	01	41
	14	2B	0	22	03
	14	2A	0	19	49
	18	4	0	00	51
	18	3	0	06	22
	18	2	0	06	41
	18	1A	0	21	99
	17	1A	0	03	25
	17	6A	0	03	51
	17	1B	0	00	44
	176	6B1	0	08	74
	17	2	0	04	48
	16	5	0	00	40
	17	3A	0	07	65
	17	3B	0	00	63
NO.35 THOPPAPATTI	87	1A	0	00	40
	87	1B	0	23	74
	8	1	0	01	47
	8	2	0	27	60
	8	3	0	01	31
	7	7B	0	03	62
	7	6	0	03	40
	7	5	0	04	76
	7	4	0	07	44
	7	3	0	03	75
	7	2	0	03	45
	7	1D	0	06	38
	6	4	0	02	62
	6	5A	0	19	80
	2	11A	0	04	51
	2	9A	0	04	39
	2	9B	0	00	75
	2	8A	0	00	66
	2	8B	0	00	50
	2	7B	0	00	53
	2	7A	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	4	6B	0	06	34
	4	6A	0	02	75
	4	5	0	14	11
	4	4B	0	03	64
	4	4A	0	10	65
	4	1	0	09	28
	4	2	0	13	03
	4	3	0	00	72
NO.34 SINGALANDAPURAM	146	-	0	21	20
	148	2B	0	01	03
	148	8	0	06	55
	148	9	0	04	19
	148	3B	0	05	41
	148	3A	0	07	23
	148	4	0	03	90
	149	20	0	02	59
	149	19B	0	01	68
	149	12D	0	00	40
	149	14	0	03	64
	149	13	0	02	22
	149	12A	0	01	65
	149	10	0	14	37
	149	9	0	01	25
	149	7B	0	11	50
	149	8	0	00	57
	157	-	0	00	64
	149	7A	0	07	81
	149	6	0	03	04
	150	19	0	15	82
	150	17	0	00	47
	150	15N	0	00	50
	150	18	0	09	29
	151	6F	0	14	46
	151	5B	0	00	40
	151	5A	0	00	40
	151	6D	0	03	63
	151	6E	0	03	42
	151	6C	0	09	53

1	2	3	4	5	6
	151	7	0	00	42
	151	6B	0	08	40
	151	6A	0	00	40
	202	3B1D	0	37	34
	202	3A2	0	13	88
	202	1	0	06	35
	205	5B	0	00	40
	205	5A	0	03	90
	205	3	0	10	82
	205	4B	0	04	25
	206	1C	0	02	96
	206	4	0	06	79
	211	1	0	06	88
	207	3	0	06	08
	207	2	0	24	86
	208	2A	0	14	07
	34	2B	0	22	72
	34	2A	0	11	75
	35	4A	0	00	89
	35	3	0	10	38
	35	2	0	00	86
	32	2	0	28	80
	24	2A1	0	59	76
	24	2B	0	13	27
	9	5	0	05	00
	9	4	0	08	91
	9	3	0	10	78
	9	2	0	03	16
	9	1A	0	07	95
	9	1B	0	00	40
	8	6	0	26	10
	7	3	0	25	09
	6	1	0	04	84
	6	3	0	20	58
	6	2	0	00	40
	12	1	0	19	33
	12	4	0	00	58
NO.21 KAKAVERI	218	2H	0	00	63
	218	2G	0	03	24
	218	2F	0	09	00
	218	2E	0	07	38
	218	2C	0	13	50
	218	2A	0	10	08

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.23 RASHI ORAM	502	2E	0	04	82
	502	2F	0	02	55
	502	2D	0	04	86
	502	2A	0	17	35
	502	2B	0	00	40
	503	1	0	32	37
	508	6	0	12	12
	508	9	0	00	40
	508	5	0	08	58
	509	2	0	15	84
	513	2A	0	00	70
	514	2A	0	20	35
	533	9	0	04	15
	533	7	0	06	33
	530	20	0	07	42
	530	16	0	14	95
	479	-	0	11	35
	476	3	0	02	22
	476	4	0	20	15
	476	6C	0	02	93
	476	5	0	00	40
	476	6B	0	13	23
	474	-	0	22	27
	453	14	0	03	44
	453	13	0	06	09
	453	11A	0	06	13
	453	11B	0	05	86
	453	10	0	00	40
	453	3	0	00	59
	453	5	0	00	76
	453	4	0	04	11
	453	25	0	03	08
	453	1A	0	00	40
	452	9	0	00	59
	452	6	0	01	13
	452	11	0	03	66
	449	4	0	03	57
	449	5	0	05	81

1	2	3	4	5	6
	445	7A	0	07	80
	445	7B	0	07	07
	447	1B	0	06	20
	447	7	0	12	06
	447	15	0	00	60
NO.25/1 CHANDRASEKARAPURAM	510	2	0	30	39
	514	4	0	10	01
	514	3	0	09	45
	37	12	0	01	77
	37	11	0	00	40
	37	13	0	11	59
	484	2	0	18	12
	541	2	0	14	28
	542	3	0	14	90
	542	4	0	17	93
	543	1	0	11	50
	455	22	0	06	76
	455	21	0	00	80
	452	18A	0	05	44
	452	15	0	04	18
	452	14	0	04	99
	446	5A	0	20	27
	446	5C	0	02	22
	538	7A	0	00	85
	538	2	0	05	84
	538	12	0	02	69
	538	10	0	04	85
	538	13	0	06	24
	539	5	0	11	16
	539	1	0	02	40
	539	4	0	05	13
NO.32 MURUNGAPATTI	2	1A	0	00	72
	2	3B1	0	01	62
	2	1B1	0	11	34
	1	1A	0	00	90
	1	1B	0	08	46
NO. 26 ANAIPALAYAM	112	2B	0	06	76
	112	2A	0	09	14
	112	1B	0	10	24
	112	1C	0	04	53

1	2	3	4	5	6
	113	3	0	05	78
	113	2B	0	07	46
	113	2A	0	00	40
	102	7B	0	01	80
	102	9A	0	09	08
	102	10A	0	11	00
	102	8A	0	00	91
	102	5	0	04	87
	102	4	0	05	60
	102	1	0	02	87
	103	2	0	34	67
	103	1	0	00	42
	46	7	0	15	09
	98	1A	0	05	30
	46	9	0	00	40
	98	2	0	00	40
	47	3	0	10	76
	47	2	0	08	88
	47	4	0	11	25
	47	1	0	02	11
	94	2	0	03	72
	94	1	0	11	87
	49	6	0	14	54
	49	1	0	05	22
	49	2	0	21	58
	50	3	0	00	50
	50	2	0	13	55
	50	1A	0	06	34
	51	3A	0	13	78
	51	3B	0	01	73
	51	2	0	21	20
	52	1	0	01	54
	51	1	0	00	74
	53	1A	0	15	28
	53	1B	0	20	65
	54	2	0	00	95
NO.27 KURUKKAPURAM	51	1B	0	21	08
	51	1A	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66	4	0	04	75
	67	3C	0	00	40
	67	3B	0	13	56
	67	3A	0	09	08
	73	4C	0	03	44
	73	4D	0	14	05
	74	4	0	19	58
	74	3	0	02	31
	76	-	0	19	59
	61	5	0	01	17
	77	-	0	21	47
	78	5	0	00	40
	78	4	0	01	18
	78	1	0	16	48
	80	2A2	0	24	09
	81	7	0	19	72
	81	6	0	06	98
	81	5	0	11	58
	86	2	0	17	63
	86	4	0	13	56
	85	1B	0	01	72
	85	1A2	0	31	82
NO.83 ELLAPPALAYAM	36	5	0	13	09
	36	3	0	00	82
	36	2	0	14	38
	35	1D	0	03	70
	35	1C	0	00	40
	34	2K	0	02	59
	34	2H	0	12	82
	34	2G	0	06	81
	34	2F	0	06	56
	34	2A	0	02	66
	34	1	0	09	25
	26	3	0	02	46
	26	1B	0	09	71
	26	1A2	0	00	40
	17	4A	0	00	40
	17	3B	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	17	3A	0	09	15
	11	2C	0	00	46
	11	2A	0	22	12
	12	2C	0	04	91
	13	8	0	03	65
	13	7	0	15	30
	13	3	0	05	47
	13	1	0	02	57
	13	2	0	07	63
	14	1B	0	02	19
	14	1A	0	00	40
NO.29 PILLANALLUR	103	6	0	11	23
	103	5	0	27	47
	102	6F	0	19	40
	104	1	0	06	38
	101	2C	0	01	48
	101	2A	0	11	39
	98	3	0	07	33
	98	5	0	00	40
	98	4	0	01	10
	52	5B	0	27	91
	52	5A	0	01	40
	53	9A	0	20	50
	53	9B	0	02	00
	53	10	0	01	56
	60	2F	0	12	01
	60	2D	0	16	69
	60	2E	0	01	16
	60	2A	0	00	66
	60	2B	0	06	68
	60	1	0	20	88
	63	6B	0	01	36
	64	2	0	13	04
	63	6A	0	03	68
	63	4B	0	01	00
	64	1	0	08	10
NO.30 PONKURICHI	34	9A	0	09	80
	34	9B	0	07	25

1	2	3	4	5	6
	34	6B1	0	05	14
	34	6A	0	06	48
	34	4B	0	04	55
	34	5	0	01	35
	34	4A	0	07	24
	32	9	0	19	53
	30	2C	0	11	25
	30	5B	0	02	07
	30	5A	0	05	32
	30	2B	0	08	72
	30	2A	0	06	12
	29	3A	0	09	90
	29	2	0	02	34
	29	3B	0	12	60
	29	3C	0	03	60
	29	4A	0	04	68
	28	14H	0	05	04
	28	14I	0	01	80
	28	14F	0	01	21
	28	14C	0	00	84
	28	14D	0	06	41
	28	12	0	00	40
	28	10	0	05	44
	28	9	0	04	29
	28	8	0	00	40
	28	2	0	05	71
	28	3	0	02	53
	27	2C	0	09	86
	27	2B	0	10	80

Taluk : Tiruchengode	District : Namakkal			State : Tamil Nadu	
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 87 KALLUPALAYAM	29	1	0	00	80
	29	2A	0	09	90
	29	3	0	10	44
	29	4	0	10	08
	30	4	0	13	68
	30	2	0	07	20
	52	1	0	09	72
	52	2	0	29	16
	48	4B	0	12	60
	48	2	0	03	78
	50	1A	0	17	10
	49	2B	0	08	86
	49	1B	0	02	76
	49	1A	0	06	81
	63	1B4	0	12	29
	63	1B3	0	01	14
	63	1A	0	06	72
	74	1B	0	08	45
	75	2B	0	06	20
	75	1C2	0	00	40
	75	1C3	0	08	53
	75	1B	0	12	07
	75	1C1	0	02	19
	77	1	0	06	15
	78	2A	0	21	57
	79	1A	0	45	68
NO. 86 MUNJANUR	185	2	0	17	60
	185	1	0	15	13
	184	2	0	17	29
	183	3	0	17	99
	183	1	0	06	18
	210	-	0	15	67

1	2	3	4	5	6
	212	2	0	11	70
	212	3D	0	15	06
	212	3F	0	00	40
	212	3E	0	13	43
	212	3C	0	00	46
	233	2	0	22	61
	215	2A	0	44	04
	216	2C	0	00	40
	217	1B	0	30	10
	217	1A	0	01	77
	218	1B	0	00	85
	218	1A	0	30	37
	219	4	0	11	64
	202	2B3	0	09	60
	202	2B4	0	05	73
	202	2A	0	15	19
NO.88 MINNAMPALLI	61	2	0	25	21
	66	1A	0	02	33
	64	5	0	12	91
	64	4	0	01	00
	70	1B	0	00	78
	70	1A	0	10	34
NO.84 MORANGAM	100	1	0	08	61
	99	-	0	32	32
	90	1D	0	12	77
	90	1C	0	10	45
	90	1A	0	05	52
	83	-	0	34	20
	85	2	0	37	09
	78	2	0	15	00
	78	1	0	00	49
	77	2	0	20	50
	76	-	0	06	32
	37	-	0	26	59
	38	-	0	06	37
	35	4	0	27	67
	36	6A	0	21	00
	36	5	0	36	56

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.92 KARUNGALPATTI	68	1	0	37	92
	40	1D	0	12	98
	40	1B	0	02	01
	40	1A	0	06	23
	39	2A	0	16	27
	43	1B	0	26	80
	43	3	0	02	37
	43	4	0	11	58
	46	2C	0	32	05
	46	2D	0	01	15
	48	4B	0	00	41
	48	3E	0	01	18
	48	3D	0	10	21
	48	4A	0	21	12
	48	3C	0	03	33
	51	4	0	30	13
	51	5	0	10	02
	53	1B	0	02	96
	25	2A	0	04	93
	25	1A	0	18	70
	22	17C	0	12	74
	22	9D	0	00	53
	22	7C	0	00	40
	22	7B	0	00	40
	22	7A	0	00	53
	22	17B	0	00	52
	22	17A	0	07	04
	22	2	0	06	72
	29	1	0	02	46
	29	2	0	00	40
	76	6	0	08	55
	29	3	0	00	89
	77	-	0	43	10
NO.93 PARUTHIPALLI	218	2	0	12	20
	218	5	0	03	36
	218	4	0	05	19
	213	4	0	02	57
	213	3	0	04	79

1	2	3	4	5	6
	219	1	0	07	56
	213	1	0	09	19
	219	7	0	00	40
	211	-	0	30	90
	207	2B	0	02	50
	207	1B	0	01	71
	207	2A	0	02	65
	207	1A	0	02	50
	196	13	0	02	46
	196	12	0	04	50
	196	8	0	03	42
	196	7	0	01	17
	196	6	0	01	50
	196	5	0	01	21
	196	3	0	01	80
	196	2	0	02	09
	196	1	0	01	86
	194	3	0	02	47
	191	7B	0	12	47
	191	7A	0	13	63
	191	4	0	02	77
	191	3	0	01	59
	191	2	0	07	40
	190	2	0	01	13
	190	1	0	02	22
	188	5	0	02	59
	188	4	0	02	57
	188	3	0	02	59
	188	2	0	13	92
	187	4	0	06	24
	187	3	0	05	81
	187	2	0	04	35
	183	4	0	03	94
	183	3	0	05	52
	183	1	0	02	43
	182	9	0	01	97
	182	10	0	01	02
	182	11	0	01	41

1	2	3	4	5	6
	182	8	0	00	40
	182	12	0	01	54
	182	13	0	05	02
	182	4	0	00	99
	182	3	0	00	46
	182	15	0	01	93
	181	6	0	00	60
	180	3	0	10	91
	180	2	0	05	00
	179	2	0	08	96
	175	3	0	08	57
	175	4	0	00	40
	175	2	0	00	64
	175	1	0	16	34
	170	7	0	06	54
	170	6	0	07	18
	170	1	0	05	50
	170	3	0	00	40
	150	1A	0	10	36
	171	19	0	00	91
	171	14C	0	00	40
	110	1B	0	28	31
	110	1C	0	04	38
	110	1A	0	17	28
	110	1D	0	01	26
	110	2	0	01	82
	105	2	0	04	71
	105	1	0	04	74
	104	5A	0	06	96
	104	2	0	11	53
	93	3C	0	00	54
	93	3B	0	12	43
	93	3A	0	00	61
	93	1B	0	07	31
	93	1A	0	09	79
	92	1A	0	40	31
	92	2	0	04	10
	76	7	0	10	41

1	2	3	4	5	6
	76	6	0	13	09
	77	4	0	05	60
	77	3	0	06	31
	77	2	0	09	02
	77	5	0	05	00
	78	3	0	05	08
	86	3	0	00	40
	78	2	0	10	63
	78	1A	0	15	11
	79	15F	0	00	40
	79	15B	0	02	18
	79	15G	0	03	96
	79	15I	0	00	40
	79	15H	0	02	28
	79	7	0	02	73
	79	8	0	02	71
	79	9	0	02	37
	79	10	0	07	17
	79	11	0	00	40
	80	17J	0	01	09
	54	5	0	05	47
	53	8	0	00	40
	54	8	0	03	69
	54	4	0	00	40
	54	3	0	07	18
	54	2	0	00	50
	54	1	0	00	95
	52	20	0	00	47
	54	11	0	42	77
	56	-	0	21	29
	58	2	0	19	03
NO.94 RAMAPURAM	81	9	0	10	51
	81	5	0	13	97
	81	4	0	07	94
	81	1	0	06	24
	87	7	0	19	98
	87	8	0	00	40
	87	2	0	15	92

1	2	3	4	5	6
	87	3	0	07	48
	72	18	0	00	76
	72	21	0	03	25
	72	20	0	02	96
	72	13D	0	06	35
	72	12	0	06	18
	74	1	0	04	88
	73	18	0	07	61
	73	10	0	03	64
	73	9	0	06	34
	73	8	0	08	77
	65	4	0	10	05
	65	3	0	10	79
	58	2B	0	33	76
	58	2A	0	03	89
	58	1	0	16	91
	61	2	0	14	29
	60	8	0	28	56
	53	2	0	28	36
	52	1	0	28	83
	51	3	0	05	76
	51	2	0	03	24
	45	2E	0	09	00
	45	2A	0	11	22
	46	3	0	32	84
NO.68 VATTUR	308	3	0	19	24
	307	-	0	27	37
	306	-	0	23	52
	305	2	0	04	36
	305	1	0	01	24
	304	1C	0	02	87
	304	1A1	0	14	94
	254	4A1	0	02	74
	254	3	0	05	75
	254	2	0	12	60
	252	3	0	23	49
	252	2	0	05	49

1	2	3	4	5	6
	233	1	0	24	52
	221	1	0	23	27
	222	-	0	45	55
	224	2	0	39	40
	219	-	0	01	14
	217	2I	0	23	94
	217	2B	0	10	04
	217	1B	0	14	79
	20	1A2	0	01	13
	20	1A1	0	28	09
	22	1A	0	23	94
	18	3	0	24	27
	24	1B	0	11	55
	24	1A	0	26	83
	25	1	0	09	82
	161	-	0	09	24
	160	2	0	46	61
	44	1	0	34	83
	44	5A	0	00	40
	33	8	0	08	87
	33	9A	0	00	40
	33	7B	0	18	46
	33	7C	0	00	58
	33	7A	0	00	55
	33	7E	0	07	33
	33	5	0	08	72
	33	4	0	05	00
	33	3A	0	00	97
	33	1A	0	01	63
NO.69 PILLANATHAM	69	2C	0	08	58
	69	2B	0	25	72
	68	3	0	07	44
	68	17	0	02	05
	68	18	0	10	18
	68	15	0	00	58
	68	14	0	06	20
	66	5B	0	12	37
	66	5A	0	15	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	65	2H	0	04	63
	65	2F	0	25	41
	65	2G	0	03	68
	65	2B	0	02	88
NO.50 KARUMAPURAM	232	4	0	00	40
	232	5	0	09	46
	232	2B	0	06	10
	232	1B	0	05	45
	231	1B	0	08	43
	231	4B	0	00	40
	231	1A	0	06	65
	231	4A	0	02	87
	231	3A	0	00	96
	230	1	0	11	67
	229	2	0	00	40
	229	3A1	0	37	39
	228	1B2	0	06	12
	228	1B1	0	03	69
	227	3B	0	00	40
	213	2A	0	20	42
	213	3	0	15	03
	213	4	0	09	10
	55	1B	0	09	72
	53	5	0	23	85
	52	6B	0	00	77
	52	6A	0	11	47
	52	2A	0	03	84
	52	1	0	09	13
	45	-	0	47	63
	44	3	0	03	72
	41	1C	0	01	19
	41	1B	0	14	74
	40	1B	0	14	92
	37	1C	0	22	13
	37	1B	0	14	09
	37	1A	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.51 THIRUMANGALAM	15	1	0	30	48
	17	7	0	22	90
	17	3	0	08	41
	19	3	0	21	93
	19	2	0	07	84
	19	1	0	16	04
	20	2	0	10	71
	20	3A	0	00	40
	30	3	0	16	76
	30	4A	0	00	40
	29	1	0	20	80
	30	2A	0	00	86
	30	1	0	02	63
	34	1A	0	13	56
	34	1B	0	00	40
	42	5	0	06	30
	42	4	0	11	74
	42	3	0	01	27
	42	1	0	00	49
	43	2B3	0	00	40
	43	2B2E	0	01	15
	43	2B1	0	05	17
	43	2A	0	06	09
	43	1B	0	09	07
	45	2B	0	12	22
	47	2C	0	12	95
	47	2B	0	00	40
	47	1	0	37	46
NO.52 KARUPPAGOUNDAMPALAYAM	14	13	0	01	07
	14	1B	0	15	61
	16	2B1	0	03	28
	16	1	0	14	91
	17	2	0	10	70
	17	1	0	04	96
	18	-	0	16	30
	19	6	0	23	28
	19	5	0	00	50

1	2	3	4	5	6
	19	4A	0	07	92
	19	3	0	00	40
	19	2	0	05	10
	21	4	0	05	40
NO.49 RAJAPALAYAM	185	3	0	18	45
	186	1	0	13	66
	178	3B	0	21	90
	185	1	0	00	40
	183	2F	0	00	40
	178	3A1	0	05	06
	183	2B	0	00	42
	183	3	0	19	78
	178	1A1	0	00	84
	180	1	0	04	54

[No. R-25011/15/2004-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1738.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी चेन्नई - तिरुच्चि-मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 4/2, आरोकियासामी स्ट्रीट, क्राफोर्ड कालोनी, तिरुचिरापल्ली - 620012 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : विर्धाचलम		जिला : कडलूर		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गोंद का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं 9 अडियूर	6	1	0	03	83
	102	1ब	0	21	20
	103	1अ2	0	05	89
	103	1अ1	0	03	68
	103	2ब	0	01	50
	103	2अ	0	08	32
	103	2क	0	00	40
	104	2ब	0	15	20
	104	2अ	0	00	40
	104	1क	0	15	40
	104	1ब	0	05	73
	107	1ब4	0	05	74
	107	1ब3	0	07	36
	107	1ब1	0	12	30
	106	2	0	00	40
	107	1ब2	0	00	40
	107	1अ2	0	05	17
	107	1अ1	0	06	14
	110	3	0	06	95
	110	2	0	09	94
	112	4	0	13	39
	113	5ब2	0	08	78
	113	5अ	0	02	67
	116	12	0	07	84
	116	17	0	05	98
	116	16	0	07	86
	116	11	0	02	69
	116	10	0	00	40
	95	1	0	02	40
	117	5	0	12	15

1	2	3	4	5	6
	117	6	0	00	40
	117	2	0	08	25
	117	8	0	02	48
	117	7	0	02	16
	118	6	0	08	35
	118	11	0	00	40
	118	10	0	10	44
	127	1	0	07	97
	127	3ड	0	00	52
	127	3अ	0	04	14
	127	2ब	0	05	34
	127	2क	0	01	50
	127	2अ	0	04	71
	122	8	0	16	10
	122	7	0	12	82
नं. 4 कोत्तनूर	219	1अ	0	02	04
	218	7	0	23	16
	218	6	0	02	41
	217	5ब	0	15	56
	217	5क	0	03	22
	217	3	0	07	93
	217	2	0	07	93
	217	4अ	0	00	45
	192	12ब	0	02	62
	192	21	0	03	43
	192	17ब	0	03	24
	192	18	0	11	78
	192	19	0	00	40
	192	16	0	05	44
	192	15	0	05	90
	192	14	0	03	76
	192	13	0	01	75
	194	7	0	05	41
	194	6	0	02	42

1	2	3	4	5	6
	194	5	0	02	25
	194	4	0	04	50
	194	2	0	03	86
	194	3क	0	00	43
	194	3ब	0	02	92
	194	1	0	01	40
	194	3अ	0	02	09
	197	5ब	0	03	64
	197	10ब	0	03	80
	197	10अ	0	02	92
	197	9अ	0	04	10
	197	9ब	0	01	48
	197	7	0	06	73
	197	8	0	00	40
	197	6एफ	0	05	17
	197	6इ	0	04	13
	197	6क	0	04	37
	197	6ड	0	03	90
	198	1अ	0	00	40
	182	5क	0	07	67
	182	5ब	0	02	98
	181	4ब	0	02	62
	181	4अ	0	02	49
	181	2ब	0	19	44
	181	2अ	0	00	85
	181	3ब	0	01	64
	181	3अ	0	03	90
	181	1अ	0	00	62
	181	1ब	0	06	60
	172	1	0	17	57
नं. 3 मलिंगेमेडू	105	6	0	08	87
	105	5	0	06	30
	105	13	0	00	40
	105	12	0	03	28

1	2	3	4	5	6
	105	4	0	04	20
	105	11ब	0	00	63
	105	3	0	02	00
	105	11अ	0	01	52
	105	2	0	00	48
	105	10	0	02	01
	105	9	0	02	31
	105	8	0	02	42
	105	7ब	0	09	18
	106	7अ	0	01	83
	106	7क	0	03	24
	106	6क	0	04	99
	106	5ब3	0	07	86
	106	5अ2	0	04	66
	101	1	0	02	50
	99	5ब	0	09	31
	99	5अ	0	06	67
	99	1ब3	0	02	97
	99	1ब2	0	04	31
	99	1अ	0	06	42
	98	2अ	0	06	70
	98	1ब	0	06	12
	98	1अ	0	12	24
	83	6ब	0	00	40
	83	6अ	0	03	44
	83	5अ	0	03	87
	83	4	0	03	60
	83	3	0	02	69
	83	2अ	0	02	32
	83	1	0	02	93
	81	9	0	01	21
	81	8	0	02	67
	81	7	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	81	6	0	02	64
	81	5ब	0	02	28
	81	5अ	0	01	00
	81	4	0	02	40
	81	3	0	01	30
	81	2	0	11	08
	81	1	0	03	91
	80	10	0	03	88
	80	9	0	03	34
	80	8	0	03	73
	80	1ब	0	03	28
	80	1अ	0	11	47
	78	11ब	0	00	40
	78	11अ	0	01	11
	78	10	0	04	59
	77	-	0	06	90
	78	4	0	06	44
	78	1	0	02	52
	78	3	0	04	34
	75	3	0	00	66
	54	—	0	02	40
	70	19अ	0	02	85
	70	18	0	02	29
	70	17	0	01	58
	70	15	0	00	79
	70	16	0	02	09
	70	14	0	01	61
	70	24	0	01	46
	70	12ब	0	01	47
	70	12अ	0	00	40
	70	8	0	01	66
	70	7	0	00	40
	70	6	0	04	67
	70	22	0	01	63

1	2	3	4	5	6
	70	5	0	02	69
	70	43अ	0	00	40
	70	3	0	02	90
	70	2	0	00	43
नं. 5 मेलकुरिच्चि	93	12	0	09	58
	93	5ब	0	01	71
	93	53अ	0	02	40
	93	3	0	00	66
	94	8	0	20	62
	94	7	0	00	51
	94	1	0	15	81
	104	3	0	10	08
	104	1	0	15	41

तालूका : तितक्कूडि	जिला : कडलूर	राज्य : तमिलनाडु	4	5	6
1	2	3	4	5	6
नं. 33 एन्डाल	3	2	0	22	36
	4	6	0	16	70
	8	11	0	03	61
	8	13	0	02	81
	8	12	0	09	98
	8	9	0	03	19
	8	8	0	03	45
	8	7	0	06	83
	8	4	0	05	65
	8	1	0	08	35
	17	6	0	03	38
	17	5	0	03	66
	17	3	0	03	84
	17	1	0	16	01
	19	2ब	0	15	15
	19	23अ	0	14	05

1	2	3	4	5	6
	19	1	0	13	19
	27	4	0	15	44
	27	5	0	01	20
	26	-	0	31	23
	25	-	0	28	84
नं. 32 कोलवाय	7	9	0	08	73
	7	8	0	06	08
	7	3	0	03	71
	7	1	0	07	05
	7	2अ	0	02	02
	8	3ब	0	03	36
	8	2ब2	0	00	70
	8	2ब1	0	02	43
	8	2अ2	0	06	14
	8	2अ1	0	01	05
	8	1अ	0	09	73
	18	12अ	0	02	42
	18	12ब	0	03	46
	18	10	0	08	01
	18	9अ	0	02	43
	18	9ब	0	04	01
	19	5ड	0	02	97
	18	9क	0	00	40
	19	5क	0	02	70
	19	5ब	0	02	82
	19	5अ	0	05	81
	20	8	0	01	78
	20	7अ	0	01	31
	20	7ब	0	00	40
	20	6ब2	0	00	40
	20	6ब1	0	01	28
	20	5	0	01	49
	20	4	0	01	94
	20	3	0	01	96

1	2	3	4	5	6
	29	8	0	09	75
	29	6क	0	03	82
	29	4इ	0	08	37
	29	4ड	0	00	92
	29	3अ	0	00	40
	29	3ब	0	04	45
	29	4एफ	0	02	82
	29	9	0	02	66
	15	1	0	00	40
	104	5	0	06	25
	104	4	0	04	70
	104	3	0	31	67
	104	1	0	03	60
	116	3	0	10	62
	116	4	0	10	14
	116	2	0	17	48
	116	1ब	0	11	25
	116	13अ	0	04	52
	117	3	0	06	28
	117	2ब	0	08	99
	117	1	0	10	04
	118	3ब	0	04	10
	118	3अ	0	01	46
	118	2	0	04	63
	118	1क	0	10	14
	118	1ड	0	03	57
	118	1ब	0	04	39
नं. 31 किल वोरटूर	120	8ब	0	08	77
	120	8क	0	04	89
	120	1	0	00	74
	120	7ब	0	06	67
	120	6	0	03	35
	120	5ब	0	05	41
	120	5अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	120	3	0	01	26
	120	2	0	03	80
	110	4	0	09	66
	110	3	0	06	63
	110	2अ	0	06	54
	110	1ब	0	06	47
	108	2ड	0	02	98
	108	2क	0	02	95
	108	2ब	0	03	15
	111	3क	0	00	77
	108	2अ	0	04	14
	108	1ब	0	07	10
	108	1अ	0	04	10
	29	5	0	11	85
	29	4	0	09	78
	29	2	0	05	41
	29	1	0	05	79
	30	5	0	19	58
	30	2	0	02	30
	30	3क	0	11	75
	30	3ब	0	00	40
	30	3अ2	0	01	29
	30	3अ1	0	01	86
	21	6अ	0	24	04
	21	6ब	0	02	85
	21	5	0	08	84
	21	4ब	0	04	57
	21	4अ	0	04	02
	21	3ब	0	01	69
	21	3अ	0	01	34
	21	2	0	02	36
	21	1	0	02	64
	14	7ब	0	13	68
	14	7अ	0	11	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
	14	5	0	13	77
	11	5	0	07	72
	11	4	0	08	50
	11	3क	0	08	05
	11	3ब	0	03	86
	11	3अ	0	04	09
	11	2	0	08	57
	11	1ब	0	04	33
	11	1अ1	0	04	55

[फा. सं. आर-25011/16/2004-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1738.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 4/2, Arockiasamy Street, Crawford Colony, Tiruchirappalli-620 012, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : VIRDHACHALAM	District : CUDDALORE			State : TAMILNADU	
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO 9.ADIYUR	6	1	0	03	83
	102	1B	0	21	20
	103	1A2	0	05	89
	103	1A1	0	03	68
	103	2B	0	01	50
	103	2A	0	08	32
	103	2C	0	00	40
	104	2B	0	15	20
	104	2A	0	00	40
	104	1C	0	15	40
	104	1B	0	05	73
	107	1B4	0	05	74
	107	1B3	0	07	36
	107	1B1	0	12	30
	106	2	0	00	40
	107	1B2	0	00	40
	107	1A2	0	05	17
	107	1A1	0	06	14
	110	3	0	06	95
	110	2	0	09	94
	112	4	0	13	39
	113	5B2	0	08	78
	113	5A	0	02	67
	116	12	0	07	84
	116	17	0	05	98
	116	16	0	07	86
	116	11	0	02	69
	116	10	0	00	40
	95	1	0	02	40
	117	5	0	12	15

1	2	3	4	5	6
	117	6	0	00	40
	117	2	0	08	25
	117	8	0	02	48
	117	7	0	02	16
	118	6	0	08	35
	118	11	0	00	40
	118	10	0	10	44
	127	1	0	07	97
	127	3D	0	00	52
	127	3A	0	04	14
	127	2B	0	05	34
	127	2C	0	01	50
	127	2A	0	04	71
	122	8	0	16	10
	122	7	0	12	82
NO 4 KOTTANUR	219	1A	0	02	04
	218	7	0	23	16
	218	6	0	02	41
	217	5B	0	15	56
	217	5C	0	03	22
	217	3	0	07	93
	217	2	0	07	93
	217	4A	0	00	45
	192	12B	0	02	62
	192	21	0	03	43
	192	17B	0	03	24
	192	18	0	11	78
	192	19	0	00	40
	192	16	0	05	44
	192	15	0	05	90
	192	14	0	03	76
	192	13	0	01	75
	194	7	0	05	41
	194	6	0	02	42

1	2	3	4	5	6
	194	5	0	02	25
	194	4	0	04	50
	194	2	0	03	86
	194	3C	0	00	43
	194	3B	0	02	92
	194	1	0	01	40
	194	3A	0	02	09
	197	5B	0	03	64
	197	10B	0	03	80
	197	10A	0	02	92
	197	9A	0	04	10
	197	9B	0	01	48
	197	7	0	06	73
	197	8	0	00	40
	197	6F	0	05	17
	197	6E	0	04	13
	197	6C	0	04	37
	197	6D	0	03	90
	198	1A	0	00	40
	182	5C	0	07	67
	182	5B	0	02	98
	181	4B	0	02	62
	181	4A	0	02	49
	181	2B	0	19	44
	181	2A	0	00	85
	181	3B	0	01	64
	181	3A	0	03	90
	181	1A	0	00	62
	181	1B	0	06	60
	172	1	0	17	57
NO 3 MALIGAIMEDU	105	6	0	08	87
	105	5	0	06	30
	105	13	0	00	40
	105	12	0	03	28

1	2	3	4	5	6
	105	4	0	04	20
	105	11B	0	00	63
	105	3	0	02	00
	105	11A	0	01	52
	105	2	0	00	48
	105	10	0	02	01
	105	9	0	02	31
	105	8	0	02	42
	105	7B	0	09	18
	106	7A	0	01	83
	106	7C	0	03	24
	106	6C	0	04	99
	106	5B3	0	07	86
	106	5A2	0	04	66
	101	1	0	02	50
	99	5B	0	09	31
	99	5A	0	06	67
	99	1B3	0	02	97
	99	1B2	0	04	31
	99	1A	0	06	42
	98	2A	0	06	70
	98	1B	0	06	12
	98	1A	0	12	24
	83	6B	0	00	40
	83	6A	0	03	44
	83	5A	0	03	87
	83	4	0	03	60
	83	3	0	02	69
	83	2A	0	02	32
	83	1	0	02	93
	81	9	0	01	21
	81	8	0	02	67
	81	7	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	81	6	0	02	64
	81	5B	0	02	28
	81	5A	0	01	00
	81	4	0	02	40
	81	3	0	01	30
	81	2	0	11	08
	81	1	0	03	91
	80	10	0	03	88
	80	9	0	03	34
	80	8	0	03	73
	80	1B	0	03	28
	80	1A	0	11	47
	78	11B	0	00	40
	78	11A	0	01	11
	78	10	0	04	59
	77	-	0	06	90
	78	4	0	06	44
	78	1	0	02	52
	78	3	0	04	34
	75	3	0	00	66
	54	-	0	02	40
	70	19A	0	02	85
	70	18	0	02	29
	70	17	0	01	58
	70	15	0	00	79
	70	16	0	02	09
	70	14	0	01	61
	70	24	0	01	46
	70	12B	0	01	47
	70	12A	0	00	40
	70	8	0	01	66
	70	7	0	00	40
	70	6	0	04	67
	70	22	0	01	63

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO 05 MELKURICHCHI	70	5	0	02	69
	70	4A	0	00	40
	70	3	0	02	90
	70	2	0	00	43
	93	12	0	09	58
	93	5B	0	01	71
	93	5A	0	02	40
	93	3	0	00	66
	94	8	0	20	62
	94	7	0	00	51
	94	1	0	15	81
	104	3	0	10	08
	104	1	0	15	41

TALUK : TITAKUDI	District : CUDDALORE		State : TAMILNADU		
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO. 33 ENDAL	3	2	0	22	36
	4	6	0	16	70
	8	11	0	03	61
	8	13	0	02	81
	8	12	0	09	98
	8	9	0	03	19
	8	8	0	03	45
	8	7	0	06	83
	8	4	0	05	65
	8	1	0	08	35
	17	6	0	03	38
	17	5	0	03	66
	17	3	0	03	84
	17	1	0	16	01
	19	2B	0	15	15
	19	2A	0	14	05
	19	1	0	13	19
	27	4	0	15	44
	27	5	0	01	20
	26	-	0	31	23
	25	-	0	28	84
NO 32 KOLAVAY	7	9	0	08	73
	7	8	0	06	08
	7	3	0	03	71
	7	1	0	07	05

1	2	3	4	5	6
	7	2A	0	02	02
	8	3B	0	03	36
	8	2B2	0	00	70
	8	2B1	0	02	43
	8	2A2	0	06	14
	8	2A1	0	01	05
	8	1A	0	09	73
	18	12A	0	02	42
	18	12B	0	03	46
	18	10	0	08	01
	18	9A	0	02	43
	18	9B	0	04	01
	19	5D	0	02	97
	18	9C	0	00	40
	19	5C	0	02	70
	19	5B	0	02	82
	19	5A	0	05	81
	20	8	0	01	78
	20	7A	0	01	31
	20	7B	0	00	40
	20	6B2	0	00	40
	20	6B1	0	01	28
	20	5	0	01	49
	20	4	0	01	94
	20	3	0	01	96
	29	8	0	09	75
	29	6C	0	03	82
	29	4E	0	08	37
	29	4D	0	00	92
	29	3A	0	00	40
	29	3B	0	04	45
	29	4F	0	02	82
	29	9	0	02	66
	15	1	0	00	40
	104	5	0	06	25
	104	4	0	04	70
	104	3	0	31	67
	104	1	0	03	60

1	2	3	4	5	6
	116	3	0	10	62
	116	4	0	10	14
	116	2	0	17	48
	116	1B	0	11	25
	116	1A	0	04	52
	117	3	0	06	28
	117	2B	0	08	99
	117	1	0	10	04
	118	3B	0	04	10
	118	3A	0	01	46
	118	2	0	04	63
	118	1C	0	10	14
	118	1D	0	03	57
	118	1B	0	04	39
NO 31 KILORATUR	120	8B	0	08	77
	120	8C	0	04	89
	120	1	0	00	74
	120	7B	0	06	67
	120	6	0	03	35
	120	5B	0	05	41
	120	5A	0	00	40
	120	3	0	01	26
	120	2	0	03	80
	110	4	0	09	66
	110	3	0	06	63
	110	2A	0	06	54
	110	1B	0	06	47
	108	2D	0	02	98
	108	2C	0	02	95
	108	2B	0	03	15
	111	3C	0	00	77
	108	2A	0	04	14
	108	1B	0	07	10
	108	1A	0	04	10
	29	5	0	11	85
	29	4	0	09	78
	29	2	0	05	41
	29	1	0	05	79
	30	5	0	19	58

1	2	3	4	5	6
	30	2	0	02	30
	30	3C	0	11	75
	30	3B	0	00	40
	30	3A2	0	01	29
	30	3A1	0	01	86
	21	6A	0	24	04
	21	6B	0	02	85
	21	5	0	08	84
	21	4B	0	04	67
	21	4A	0	04	02
	21	3B	0	01	69
	21	3A	0	01	34
	21	2	0	02	36
	21	1	0	02	64
	14	7B	0	13	68
	14	7A	0	11	32
	14	5	0	13	77
	11	5	0	07	72
	11	4	0	08	50
	11	3C	0	08	05
	11	3B	0	03	86
	11	3A	0	04	09
	11	2	0	08	57
	11	1B	0	04	33
	11	1A1	0	04	55

[No. R-25011/18/2004-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1739.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस

दिन के भीतर भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी चेत्रई - तिरुच्चि-मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 4/2, आरोकियासामी स्ट्रीट, क्राफोर्ड कालोनी, तिरुचिरापल्ली - 620012 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालूका : कल्लकुरिच्चि		जिला : विल्लुपुरम		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
न 146 कुंडलूर	125	4	0	02	88
	127	8	0	01	44
	129	1	0	22	50
	142	1इ	0	17	64
	142	1क	0	03	04
	142	1ब	0	03	38
	142	1अ	0	20	77
	139	3अ	0	00	40
	139	2ब	0	00	63
	139	2अ	0	02	07
	139	1	0	22	72
	141	7क	0	08	36
	141	6	0	07	70
	170	1	0	00	40
	170	2	0	06	41
	143	1अ	0	09	31
	143	1ब	0	00	40
	149		0	16	13
	148	1ब	0	21	22
	148	1अ	0	14	19
	151	2	0	04	21
	151	1ब	0	03	52
	151	1ड	0	08	41
	151	1एफ	0	00	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	151	1इ	0	05	01
	151	1जि	0	08	33
	151	1हेच	0	02	98
	155	2ब	0	05	75
	153	1	0	18	19
	154	6	0	16	90
नं. 147 एरांजे	33		0	20	79
	35	2अ	0	12	44
	35	1	0	00	40
	35	2ब	0	10	83
	35	3	0	00	66
	47	8	0	07	91
	45	3ब	0	01	66
	45	3अ	0	03	56
	45	2	0	12	92
	45	1	0	12	82
	45	4	0	00	40
	46	3	0	06	42
	42	6	0	01	54
	42	1	0	06	74
	42	2	0	05	18
	42	3	0	02	63
	42	4	0	08	75
	58	5	0	11	35
	138	3	0	00	59
	138	4	0	02	38
	138	5	0	04	19
	138	6	0	03	97
	138	7	0	03	60
	138	8	0	03	60

1	2	3	4	5	6
	138	9	0	04	81
	138	10	0	02	51
	138	2	0	04	24
	136	2	0	07	04
	136	1	0	04	86
	113	14	0	07	37
	113	15	0	06	55
	114	5क	0	06	26
	114	9अ	0	00	40
	114	5ब	0	06	75
	114	5अ	0	06	07
	114	3ब	0	02	69
	114	6ब	0	00	40
	114	6अ	0	03	56
	117	7	0	00	40
	117	10	0	00	40
	117	9	0	01	39
	117	8	0	01	21
	117	15	0	00	40
	117	14	0	00	95
	117	12	0	02	60
	117	13	0	00	40
	117	5	0	02	04
	117	6	0	01	29
	117	2	0	03	32
	117	1	0	01	41
	119	7	0	00	40
	119	5	0	02	65
	119	6अ	0	00	40
	119	2	0	01	40
	119	3	0	01	79
	119	4	0	00	40
	119	1	0	05	96
	119	11	0	00	40
	99	6	0	02	22

1	2	3	4	5	6
	99	7	0	01	60
	99	1	0	00	82
	99	8	0	00	40
	99	11	0	00	40
	99	9	0	00	40
	99	3	0	01	00
	99	5	0	00	45
	99	2	0	00	97
	99	4	0	01	00
	100	1	0	04	90
	100	3	0	00	53
	100	2	0	03	65
	96	7	0	00	76
	98	1	0	02	81
	98	2	0	00	89
	96	8	0	01	93
	96	9	0	02	36
	96	6ड	0	00	52
	96	5	0	01	46
	96	6इ	0	00	40
	96	6ब	0	01	94
	96	6क	0	03	67
	96	6अ	0	00	40
	97	2	0	00	42
	97	1	0	17	27
	92	12अ	0	00	40
	93	26	0	00	50
	92	11	0	06	95
	92	3	0	00	42
	92	5	0	02	90
	92	4	0	00	40
	92	6	0	03	41
	92	7	0	00	88
	92	9अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	92	9ब	0	00	40
	88	1एम	0	01	23
	88	1एन	0	08	35
	91	8	0	00	40
	91	7	0	00	80
	88	एल	0	02	53
	91	6	0	01	46
	91	5	0	04	87
	88	3	0	00	40
	88	4	0	01	76
	91	1	0	02	00
	91	2	0	00	87
	88	2	0	01	73
	89	2	0	08	23
	89	4	0	12	48
नं 142 कुत्तकुडि	120	6	0	05	11
	120	7	0	00	40
	120	2	0	01	65
	120	3	0	00	72
	120	4	0	01	02
	120	5	0	02	34
	120	14अ	0	00	83
	124	7ब	0	05	27
	121	7	0	00	40
	122	6ब	0	01	45
	122	6अ	0	01	07
	122	5ब	0	01	87
	122	5अ	0	02	82
	122	4अ	0	04	60
	124	7अ	0	00	64
	122	4ब	0	00	92
	122	2	0	00	81
	122	3अ	0	03	69
	122	3ब	0	00	89

1	2	3	4	5	6
	123	13अ	0	03	47
	123	13ब	0	01	42
	123	12ब	0	02	02
	123	9	0	05	26
	123	5	0	02	98
	123	6	0	03	20
	123	1ब	0	06	35
	125	12	0	07	18
	115	5अ	0	04	09
	115	2एफ	0	00	40
	115	3	0	05	48
	115	2जि	0	05	01
	115	1अ	0	06	28
	115	1ब	0	00	40
	134	1	0	05	52
	132	17	0	00	40
	136	11	0	10	31
	134	3	0	00	46
	134	2ब	0	00	61
	134	2अ	0	06	23
	100	7अ2	0	00	40
	100	7अ1	0	04	96
	100	6	0	03	80
	100	5अ	0	06	96
	100	1	0	04	23
	93	2	0	14	50
	93	1	0	05	49
	94	1	0	18	18
	85	-	0	22	47
	80	5	0	11	35
	80	8	0	01	58
	80	7	0	06	62
	80	6	0	09	68

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66अ	4ब	0	09	05
	66अ	3ब	0	05	03
	66अ	2ब	0	03	97
	66अ	1ब	0	01	47
	66अ	10	0	02	77
	66अ	8	0	03	99
	66अ	5	0	04	10
	66अ	6	0	01	57
	67	7	0	06	74
	67	5क	0	01	49
	62अ	7क	0	15	36
	62ब	1	0	01	85
	64	2ब	0	13	01
	64	2अ	0	01	50
	64	3ब	0	01	95
	64	3अ	0	03	14
	64	5अ	0	12	61
	63	7	0	08	04
	63	6क	0	09	45
	63	6ब	0	08	79
	63	6अ	0	00	94
	63	5	0	03	65
	18	1	0	09	00
	19	2अ	0	00	82
	19	2ब	0	09	65
	19	1ब1ब	0	05	73
	19	1ब1अ	0	03	53
	19	1ब2अ	0	01	60
	22ब	16	0	05	56
	22ब	14	0	05	20
	22ब	13क	0	07	94
	22ब	13ब	0	08	07

1	2	3	4	5	6
	22ब	12ब	0	08	73
नं 138 असकलटूर	115	2	0	08	48
	115	3	0	01	66
	115	1	0	08	59
	116	8	0	04	87
	116	7एफ	0	02	78
	116	7ब	0	03	19
	116	7अ	0	00	90
	116	3क	0	01	31
	116	3ब	0	01	42
	116	3अ	0	01	29
	116	2	0	02	06
	116	1	0	02	17
	120	2इ3	0	00	40
	120	2एफ	0	04	40
	120	6अ	0	04	53
	120	6ब	0	00	42
	120	5	0	05	58
	120	11अ	0	00	99
	120	9	0	02	64
	120	8	0	02	49
	120	4	0	04	46
	123	4अ5	0	08	07
	124	2	0	21	03
	123	3	0	01	62
	123	2	0	01	51
	123	1	0	01	85
	124	1	0	21	01
	127	1अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	21	0	02	83
	146	6ड	0	02	45
	146	6क	0	00	46
	146	19ब	0	00	40
	146	20ब	0	01	79
	146	20अ	0	00	95
	146	19अ	0	00	40
	146	18ब	0	01	08
	146	18अ	0	01	93
	145	5अ	0	00	40
	146	15ब	0	00	40
	146	16	0	01	95
	146	13	0	01	07
	146	12ब	0	01	63
	145	4	0	00	81
	145	23अ	0	01	28
	145	13अ	0	03	51
	146	11	0	00	64
	144	11	0	00	40
	144	12	0	02	66
	144	13	0	02	47
	144	27	0	07	14
	144	5अ	0	00	91
	152	12ब	0	03	62
	152	12अ	0	02	16
	152	6ड	0	01	81
	152	8	0	00	75
	160	5	0	00	69
	160	4	0	00	85

1	2	3	4	5	6
	160	3	0	01	53
	160	2	0	02	17
	160	1	0	05	55
	159	9३	0	02	95
	159	93H	0	03	11
	159	73H	0	00	40
	159	8३	0	04	21
	159	2	0	14	22
	159	4	0	00	40
	158	2	0	04	15
	162	1	0	00	40
	158	16	0	01	22
	158	14	0	01	42
	158	13	0	01	67
	158	11	0	04	69
	158	1३2	0	00	42
	158	7	0	01	92
	158	6	0	01	07
	158	5	0	03	70
	158	4	0	04	28
	158	3	0	03	80
	157	8	0	05	87
	157	6३	0	03	49
	157	5	0	03	86
	157	4	0	06	84
	157	3	0	09	53
	186	17	0	04	41
	186	16	0	05	16
	186	13	0	03	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	186	12	0	04	99
	186	9	0	00	40
	186	8	0	03	50
	186	3	0	00	43
	186	2ब	0	01	15
	186	2अ	0	03	23
	186	7	0	02	90
	190	16	0	01	08
	190	15	0	01	36
	190	14अ	0	01	63
	190	12क	0	01	96
	190	12अ	0	01	81
	190	9	0	02	64
	190	6	0	02	77
	190	5	0	00	40
	190	2	0	12	22
	190	1ब	0	01	61
	191	5	0	14	51
नं 130 इरियूर	279	15	0	11	01
	279	14	0	08	32
	279	13	0	09	04
	279	9	0	05	39
	279	8	0	04	42
	279	7	0	01	59
	279	4	0	00	60
	279	1	0	03	96
	279	3	0	00	40
	277	13	0	10	23
	277	14	0	08	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
	277	10	0	03	34
	276	1	0	10	73
	251	4	0	06	03
	251	1इ	0	07	09
	251	1ड	0	03	58
	251	1क	0	03	62
	251	1ब	0	04	72
	251	1अ	0	03	29
	252	13इ	0	04	61
	252	13ड	0	08	34
	252	12क	0	00	40
	252	12अ	0	06	44
	252	12ब	0	00	69
	252	8	0	01	01
	252	9	0	14	42
	254	2	0	15	81
	254	1ब	0	21	30
	260	24	0	04	18
	260	23ब	0	08	60
	260	19	0	07	45
	260	18	0	07	67
	260	16ब	0	07	28
	260	15	0	07	30
	259	1	0	01	68
	260	25	0	02	90
	265	5	0	04	41
	265	14	0	06	26
	265	6ब	0	00	44
	265	8	0	03	90

1	2	3	4	5	6
	265	11अ	0	00	40
	265	4क	0	02	97
	265	10अ	0	03	13
	265	10ब	0	00	40
	265	3क	0	00	68
	265	9अ	0	02	97
	265	9ब	0	02	83
	266	7ब	0	01	14
	266	7अ	0	02	00
	266	6अ	0	01	39
	266	6ब	0	06	69
	270	4क	0	02	20
	269	12	0	06	75
	270	5	0	07	24
	270	43अ	0	09	87
	270	1	0	21	47
	270	2	0	16	75
	150	2	0	19	21
	149	13अ	0	03	57
	149	1ब	0	15	64
	149	2	0	01	27
	148	7	0	09	52
	147	6	0	20	34
	147	5क	0	07	73
	147	5ब	0	07	61
	147	5अ	0	02	28
	146	3ब	0	06	81
	146	2	0	11	31

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	1	0	10	61
	145	3	0	02	32
	335	4	0	07	16
	335	3अ	0	14	37
	341	2ड	0	11	49
	341	2क	0	08	12
	341	3	0	00	40
	341	1ड	0	01	69
	341	1क	0	12	20
	341	1ब	0	02	85
	341	1अ	0	05	79
	343	1	0	15	42
	343	2	0	20	15
	344	5अ	0	08	50
	344	5ब	0	00	40
	344	4अ	0	07	49
	344	3अ	0	07	50
	345	1	0	27	44
नं 129 करुगुली	174	6	0	14	28
	174	5	0	12	23
	174	2ब	0	08	96
	174	2अ	0	02	78
	174	1	0	14	38
	173	4ब	0	09	04
	173	3ब	0	06	55
	173	2ब	0	07	31
	173	1ब	0	03	49
	166	1ब	0	12	67

1	2	3	4	5	6
	166	1अ2	0	00	53
	164	8क	0	09	14
	164	7	0	11	27
	164	3	0	15	88
	111	4ब	0	06	89
	111	4अ	0	06	65
	111	3अ	0	12	81
	111	3ब	0	00	73
	111	2क	0	05	63
	111	2ड	0	01	53
	111	2ब	0	04	51
	111	2अ	0	00	40
	113	20हच	0	01	19
	113	20ड	0	02	39
	113	20क	0	04	13
	113	20ब	0	02	69
	113	20अ	0	02	24
	123	2अ	0	02	01
	146	2	0	01	96
	146	1ब	0	03	56
	146	1अ	0	05	32
	147	3ब	0	00	40
	145	3	0	01	25
	145	4	0	01	91
	145	2	0	03	68
	144	4	0	05	65
	144	1	0	04	70
	140	4	0	03	76
	140	5	0	05	10
	129	4क	0	00	76

1	2	3	4	5	6
	139		0	12	95
	135	22	0	00	79
	135	20ब	0	03	08
	135	21	0	02	73
	135	16	0	00	40
	134	9	0	02	15
	134	8	0	07	72
	134	1	0	00	40
	134	2	0	01	57
	134	6	0	02	00
	134	5	0	00	62
	134	4	0	00	40
	134	3	0	00	40
	134	7	0	04	98
	49	14	0	00	40
	50	4	0	03	50
	50	3	0	06	00
	50	6	0	02	38
	50	2	0	00	98
	50	5	0	04	52
नं 127 अम्मकलट्टूर	143	6	0	01	40
	143	5	0	02	67
	144	3	0	04	28
	146	7	0	05	02
	146	6	0	02	94
	146	5	0	02	92
	146	3	0	04	65
	146	9	0	01	12
	146	8	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	2	0	02	74
	161	2	0	00	41
	161	3	0	19	90
	157	1	0	07	18
	157	2	0	00	40
	160	6	0	01	70
	158	13अ	0	20	92
	158	1ब	0	00	50
	159	9ब	0	10	69
	159	8ब	0	00	40
	159	8क	0	04	35
	154	5	0	01	39
	154	33अ	0	05	00
	159	10	0	04	99
	159	6	0	07	88
	189	1क	0	00	40
	189	3	0	06	87
	189	43अ	0	04	33
	189	4ब1	0	00	40
	189	2	0	02	43
	190	2	0	09	75
	190	1ड	0	01	47
	190	1ब	0	06	36
	190	1क	0	06	16
	187	7	0	08	50
	187	14	0	05	58
	187	5	0	07	91
	187	13	0	01	02

1	2	3	4	5	6
	195	2	0	02	74
	195	3	0	13	88
	195	4	0	04	05
न 128 सेबाकुरिच्चि	176	3अ	0	10	27
	176	2	0	09	20
	176	1	0	07	91
	171	9	0	09	54
	171	6	0	03	17
	171	8	0	18	08
	171	7	0	10	34
	171	1	0	10	04
	172	1	0	03	82
न 126 तेन सिरुवल्लूर	60	2	0	00	53
	61	6	0	02	18
	61	4	0	02	35
	62	2	0	12	21
	61	2	0	09	66
	61	1	0	03	65
	62	1	0	06	31
	63	1	0	00	40
	63	3	0	23	77
	69	3	0	10	46
	69	4	0	03	22
	69	5	0	04	77
	69	6	0	04	70
	70	1	0	17	08
	71	5	0	21	02
	71	3	0	10	58
	196	2अ	0	12	71

1	2	3	4	5	6
	196	13	0	07	75
	197	3	0	05	44
	197	2	0	13	34
	197	4	0	08	92
	198	2	0	10	28
	198	3	0	04	30
	198	1	0	16	14
	199	2	0	10	54
	203	2	0	04	67
नं 116 अनुमनंदा	31	6	0	07	24
	31	9	0	16	32
	31	10	0	07	66
	32	9	0	05	52
	32	8	0	18	08
	32	4	0	10	13
नं 117 नायिनारपालेयम	126	3	0	19	71
	127	1	0	03	27
	128	5	0	01	94
	128	6	0	21	27
	130	4	0	05	16
	129	4	0	04	16
	130	5	0	03	01
	130	6	0	00	56
	130	2	0	10	29
	141	6	0	01	74
	141	7	0	01	36
	141	3	0	12	12
	140	33	0	12	43
	138	42	0	01	80

1	2	3	4	5	6
	138	4ब1	0	01	66
	139	5ब	0	00	40
	138	4अ	0	04	55
	138	3ब	0	05	74
	138	13	0	00	40
	138	3अ	0	07	41
	138	11ब	0	04	52
	138	2ड	0	00	40
	138	9	0	00	40
	138	11अ	0	01	93
	138	12	0	08	07
	137	3एफ	0	05	35
	137	3इ	0	03	64
	137	3ड	0	03	73
	137	3क	0	01	35
	158	1	0	07	71
	99	12इ	0	02	98
	99	8ब	0	00	40
	99	12ड	0	03	00
	99	8अ	0	18	81
	162	6	0	05	22
	99	7	0	00	40
	162	5	0	04	72
	163	3	0	14	53
	163	2	0	12	27
	163	5ब	0	01	38
	163	5अ	0	10	49
	165	4	0	15	37
	165	5	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	165	10ब	0	15	04
	171	14	0	10	24
	171	7	0	03	73
	171	12	0	06	78
	171	5	0	05	76
	172	6	0	18	34
	172	5	0	09	18
	172	3	0	08	69
	176	1	0	06	34
	176	2	0	10	41
	178	4	0	12	71
	178	6	0	05	34
	178	7	0	00	61
	178	5	0	04	82
	179	3	0	06	85
	179	1	0	03	41
	179	5	0	03	49
	180	2	0	16	17
	181	10	0	17	73
	181	2	0	05	31
	196	1	0	01	03
	196	3	0	02	41
	219	1	0	28	90
	219	8	0	01	90
	219	5	0	21	49
	218	8अ	0	04	89
	218	7	0	10	36
	218	1ब	0	16	54
	218	13अ	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	215	1क	0	02	69
	215	1ब	0	00	97
	215	1अ	0	06	24
	215	2	0	35	29
	212	1	0	05	01
	212	2	0	16	66
	212	3	0	04	47
नं 106 पेट्ससमुद्रम	2	1क	0	03	88
	2	1ब	0	19	11
	2	2ब	0	02	38
	2	1अ	0	04	57
	2	4	0	11	70
	2	5	0	02	11
	1	5अ3	0	09	42
	1	5अ4अ	0	09	29
	1	4ब	0	00	73
	1	4अ	0	02	68
	1	3ब	0	05	37
	1	3अ	0	00	70
	6	4	0	05	65
	5	1	0	09	67
	6	1अ	0	19	08
	6	9	0	09	00
	13	1अ	0	08	95
	19	4	0	11	32
	19	6ब	0	00	40
	19	6अ	0	00	40
	19	8	0	04	11
	19	2	0	10	86

1	2	3	4	5	6
	22	1	0	07	65
	24	6	0	05	90
	24	5	0	05	16
	24	4	0	06	64
	24	3अ	0	05	29
	24	2ब	0	03	56
	24	2अ	0	02	07
	24	1अ	0	01	99
	30	5	0	04	00
	30	4	0	05	93
	30	3	0	07	14
	30	2	0	05	03
	30	1	0	06	38
	34	5	0	04	53
	34	4	0	04	47
	34	3ब	0	03	17
	34	3अ	0	01	31
	34	2ब	0	02	49
	34	2अ	0	03	99
	34	1क2	0	00	40
	35	11अ	0	04	56
	35	11ब	0	01	85
	35	10	0	05	12
	35	9	0	09	63
	35	8	0	04	63
	35	7	0	04	57
	35	4	0	03	11
	35	5	0	04	18
	55	7ब	0	00	64

1	2	3	4	5	6
	91	10	0	01	50
	91	9	0	01	46
	91	8क	0	02	24
	91	8ड	0	00	71
	91	11	0	01	18
	91	7	0	01	10
	91	5	0	00	40
	93	13अ	0	00	57
	182	1	0	19	03
	191	5	0	04	61
	191	63अ	0	07	60
	191	6ब	0	01	85
	191	73अ	0	00	42
	191	7ब	0	13	46
	191	8ब	0	16	05
	189	3	0	02	59
	189	4	0	30	12
	189	5ड	0	05	88
	189	5क	0	07	49
	189	5ब	0	02	49
	189	53अ	0	00	40
	190	8	0	06	53
	190	2	0	14	04
	190	3	0	06	77
	190	1क	0	01	95
नं. 104 दत्ताद्रिपुरम	9	83अ	0	03	72
	9	33अ1	0	11	57
	9	33अ2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	9	6अ	0	02	40
	9	6ब	0	24	91
	8	4क	0	00	40
	8	4ब	0	02	37
	8	4अ	0	03	70
	8	3ब	0	18	83
	8	1ब	0	07	83
	8	2अ	0	10	26
	24	5	0	09	06
	24	3अ	0	03	20
	24	3ब	0	20	11
नं 103 कल्लसमुद्रम	1	8	0	13	06
	2	4	0	17	46
	1	3क	0	03	39
	2	5ब	0	01	08
	2	6	0	14	80
	5	2ब	0	07	67
	5	1ब	0	14	33
	6	2ब	0	05	88
	6	5ब	0	07	93
	6	1अ	0	13	03
	12	10क	0	02	90
	12	10ब	0	04	67
	12	10ड	0	02	65
	12	9ब	0	02	46
	12	9अ	0	02	98
	12	8ब	0	02	34
	12	8अ	0	01	29
	12	7	0	07	36

1	2	3	4	5	6
	12	3	0	07	00
	12	10हेच	0	00	40
	12	6	0	02	14
	12	5क	0	00	40
	12	5ब	0	00	70
	12	10ऐ	0	01	69
	15	12ब	0	05	95
	15	12अ	0	06	35
	15	11	0	02	85
	15	15	0	02	92
	15	14	0	02	57
	15	13	0	02	69
	15	10	0	07	78
	10	8	0	00	40
	10	7	0	00	67
	10	6	0	01	14
	10	5	0	04	39
	15	9	0	00	40
	10	2	0	06	51
	27	5	0	07	70
	27	4	0	04	00
	27	11	0	04	30
	27	10	0	04	65
	27	9	0	04	88
	30	1ड	0	03	33
	31	6क2	0	00	40
	31	10	0	00	64
	31	11	0	00	96
	30	1इ	0	03	99

1	2	3	4	5	6
	30	1क	0	03	27
	30	1ब	0	04	01
	31	4ब	0	03	06
	31	4अ1	0	03	70
	39		0	11	25
	38	6	0	01	58
	38	8	0	11	00
	38	7अ	0	00	40
	38	7ब	0	08	84
	37	3	0	00	40
	37	2	0	01	05
	37	1	0	02	26
	36	3	0	01	92
	36	2ब	0	02	02
	34	10	0	01	45
	36	2अ	0	01	36
	36	1	0	03	24
	35	7	0	10	43
	35	9अ2	0	00	62
	35	9अ1	0	00	40
	35	6ब	0	01	87
	35	6क	0	02	00
	35	8	0	04	10
	48	16	0	01	84
	48	17ब	0	03	16
	48	17अ	0	04	42
	48	18	0	00	48
	49	1ब4	0	05	96
	49	1ब3	0	10	17

1	2	3	4	5	6
	49	1व5	0	00	45
	50	3व2	0	14	77
	50	9	0	02	20
	50	4	0	01	56
	50	3व1	0	01	50
	50	3अ3	0	05	29
	50	3अ2	0	00	48
	50	3अ1	0	02	78
न 102 दगामतीर्तपुरम	205	3	0	10	58
	205	1	0	20	28
	206	3व	0	01	10
	206	3अ	0	21	69
	206	1व	0	03	36
	206	1अ	0	03	84
	208	5	0	05	28
	208	4	0	04	31
	208	3	0	07	73
	208	2	0	04	05
	208	1	0	04	54
	198	8	0	05	19
	198	10	0	02	79
	198	6	0	05	27
	198	5	0	02	27
	199	6	0	01	03
	198	4	0	02	46
	198	3	0	04	66
	199	8	0	04	60
	198	2	0	01	08
	199	7	0	12	02

1	2	3	4	5	6
	196	3	0	08	54
	196	2	0	07	74
	196	1	0	09	61
	225	3	0	12	00
	225	2	0	10	52
	225	13	0	06	85
	225	11	0	01	36
	225	1	0	03	47
	226	1	0	05	37
	168		0	21	34
	162	20ब	0	01	05
	160	11ब	0	05	97
	160	10	0	12	38
	160	9	0	02	05
	160	8	0	02	14
	160	7	0	02	26
	160	6	0	02	15
	160	4	0	02	60
	160	3ब	0	02	59
	160	3अ	0	01	01
	160	1	0	11	25
	158	4क	0	07	21
	158	4ड	0	09	16
	158	12ब	0	00	40
	158	4द	0	00	64
	248	9ब	0	01	97
	248	9अ	0	6	24
	248	7ब	0	02	48
	248	9क	0	00	54
	248	7क	0	03	76
	248	9ड	0	00	57
	248	9इ	0	01	64
	248	5अ	0	00	40
	248	7अ	0	03	97
	248	8	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	249	5क1	0	06	84
	249	5क2	0	01	87
	249	5ड1ब	0	05	79
	249	5ड2	0	01	23
नं 101 पुडि	249	5ड1अ	0	01	50
	75	2	0	16	93
	76	5	0	09	33
	76	4	0	00	69
	76	2	0	03	92
	77	10	0	13	39
	77	11	0	01	23
	77	1	0	00	60
नं 99 रायप्पनूर	77	9	0	29	83
	376	10	0	19	43
	376	13	0	11	90
	376	9	0	03	83

[फा. सं. आर-25011/17/2004-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1739.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published

in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 4/2, Arockiasamy Street, Crawford Colony, Tiruchirappalli-620 012, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : KALLAKURICHCHI	District : VILLUPURAM		State : TAMILNADU		
Name of the Village	Survey No.	Sub-Division No.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.146 KUNDALUR	125	4	0	02	88
	127	8	0	01	44
	129	1	0	22	50
	142	1E	0	17	64
	142	1C	0	03	04
	142	1B	0	03	38
	142	1A	0	20	77
	139	3A	0	00	40
	139	2B	0	00	63
	139	2A	0	02	07
	139	1	0	22	72
	141	7C	0	08	36
	141	6	0	07	70
	170	1	0	00	40
	170	2	0	06	41
	143	1A	0	09	31
	143	1B	0	00	40
	149	-	0	16	13
	148	1B	0	21	22
		1A	0	14	19
	151	2	0	04	21
	151	1B	0	03	52
	151	1D	0	08	41
	151	1F	0	00	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	151	1E	0	05	01
	151	1G	0	08	33
	151	1H	0	02	98
	155	2B	0	05	75
	153	1	0	18	19
	154	6	0	16	90
NO.147 ERANJI	33	-	0	20	79
	35	2A	0	12	44
	35	1	0	00	40
	35	2B	0	10	83
	35	3	0	00	66
	47	8	0	07	91
	45	3B	0	01	66
	45	3A	0	03	56
	45	2	0	12	92
	45	1	0	12	82
	45	4	0	00	40
	46	3	0	06	42
	42	6	0	01	54
	42	1	0	06	74
	42	2	0	05	18
	42	3	0	02	63
	42	4	0	08	75
	58	5	0	11	35

1	2	3	4	5	6
	138	3	0	00	59
	138	4	0	02	38
	138	5	0	04	19
	138	6	0	03	97
	138	7	0	03	60
	138	8	0	03	60
	138	9	0	04	81
	138	10	0	02	51
	138	2	0	04	24
	136	2	0	07	04
	136	1	0	04	86
	113	14	0	07	37
	113	15	0	06	55
	114	5C	0	06	26
	114	9A	0	00	40
	114	5B	0	06	75
	114	5A	0	06	07
	114	3B	0	02	69
	114	6B	0	00	40
	114	6A	0	03	56
	117	7	0	00	40
	117	10	0	00	40
	117	9	0	01	39
	117	8	0	01	21
	117	15	0	00	40
	117	14	0	00	95
	117	12	0	02	60
	117	13	0	00	40
	117	5	0	02	04

1	2	3	4	5	6
	117	6	0	01	29
	117	2	0	03	32
	117	1	0	01	41
	119	7	0	00	40
	119	5	0	02	65
	119	6A	0	00	40
	119	2	0	01	40
	119	3	0	01	79
	119	4	0	00	40
	119	1	0	05	96
	119	11	0	00	40
	99	6	0	02	22
	99	7	0	01	60
	99	1	0	00	82
	99	8	0	00	40
	99	11	0	00	40
	99	9	0	00	40
	99	3	0	01	00
	99	5	0	00	45
	99	2	0	00	97
	99	4	0	01	00
	100	1	0	04	90
	100	3	0	00	53
	100	2	0	03	65
	96	7	0	00	76
	98	1	0	02	81
	98	2	0	00	89
	96	8	0	01	93
	96	9	0	02	36

1	2	3	4	5	6
	96	6D	0	00	52
	96	5	0	01	46
	96	6E	0	00	40
	96	6B	0	01	94
	96	6C	0	03	67
	96	6A	0	00	40
	97	2	0	00	42
	97	1	0	17	27
	92	12A	0	00	40
	93	26	0	00	50
	92	11	0	06	95
	92	3	0	00	42
	92	5	0	02	90
	92	4	0	00	40
	92	6	0	03	41
	92	7	0	00	88
	92	9A	0	00	40
	92	9B	0	00	40
	88	1M	0	01	23
	88	1N	0	08	35
	91	8	0	00	40
	91	7	0	00	80
	88	1L	0	02	53
	91	6	0	01	46
	91	5	0	04	87
	88	3	0	00	40
	88	4	0	01	76
	91	1	0	02	00
	91	2	0	00	87

1	2	3	4	5	6
	88	2	0	01	73
	89	2	0	08	23
	89	4	0	12	48
NO.142 KUTTAKUDI	120	6	0	05	11
	120	7	0	00	40
	120	2	0	01	65
	120	3	0	00	72
	120	4	0	01	02
	120	5	0	02	34
	120	14A	0	00	83
	124	7B	0	05	27
	121	7	0	00	40
	122	6B	0	01	45
	122	6A	0	01	07
	122	5B	0	01	87
	122	5A	0	02	82
	122	4A	0	04	60
	124	7A	0	00	64
	122	4B	0	00	92
	122	2	0	00	81
	122	3A	0	03	69
	122	3B	0	00	89
	123	13A	0	03	47
	123	13B	0	01	42
	123	12B	0	02	02
	123	9	0	05	26
	123	5	0	02	98
	123	6	0	03	20
	123	1B	0	06	35

1	2	3	4	5	6
	125	12	0	07	18
	115	5A	0	04	09
	115	2F	0	00	40
	115	3	0	05	48
	115	2G	0	05	01
	115	1A	0	06	28
	115	1B	0	00	40
	134	1	0	05	52
	132	17	0	00	40
	136	11	0	10	31
	134	3	0	00	46
	134	2B	0	00	61
	134	2A	0	06	23
	100	7A2	0	00	40
	100	7A1	0	04	96
	100	6	0	03	80
	100	5A	0	06	96
	100	1	0	04	23
	93	2	0	14	50
	93	1	0	05	49
	94	1	0	18	18
	85	-	0	22	47
	80	5	0	11	35
	80	8	0	01	58
	80	7	0	06	62
	80	6	0	09	68
	66A	4B	0	09	05
	66A	3B	0	05	03
	66A	2B	0	03	97

1	2	3	4	5	6
	66A	1B	0	01	47
	66A	10	0	02	77
	66A	8	0	03	99
	66A	5	0	04	10
	66A	6	0	01	57
	67	7	0	06	74
	67	5C	0	01	49
	62A	7C	0	15	36
	62B	1	0	01	85
	64	2B	0	13	01
	64	2A	0	01	50
	64	3B	0	01	95
	64	3A	0	03	14
	64	5A	0	12	61
	63	7	0	08	04
	63	6C	0	09	45
	63	6B	0	08	79
	63	6A	0	00	94
	63	5	0	03	65
	18	1	0	09	00
	19	2A	0	00	82
	19	2B	0	09	65
	19	1B1B	0	05	73
	19	1B1A	0	03	53
	19	1B2A	0	01	60
	22B	16	0	05	56
	22B	14	0	05	20
	22B	13C	0	07	94
	22B	13B	0	08	07

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.138 ASAKALATTUR	22B	12B	0	08	73
	115	2	0	08	48
	115	3	0	01	66
	115	1	0	08	59
	116	8	0	04	87
	116	7F	0	02	78
	116	7B	0	03	19
	116	7A	0	00	90
	116	3C	0	01	31
	116	3B	0	01	42
	116	3A	0	01	29
	116	2	0	02	06
	116	1	0	02	17
	120	2E3	0	00	40
	120	2F	0	04	40
	120	6A	0	04	53
	120	6B	0	00	42
	120	5	0	05	58
	120	11A	0	00	99
	120	9	0	02	64
	120	8	0	02	49
	120	4	0	04	46
	123	4A5	0	08	07
	124	2	0	21	03
	123	3	0	01	62
	123	2	0	01	51
	123	1	0	01	85
	124	1	0	21	01
	127	1A	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	21	0	02	83
	146	6D	0	02	45
	146	6C	0	00	46
	146	19B	0	00	40
	146	20B	0	01	79
	146	20A	0	00	95
	146	19A	0	00	40
	146	18B	0	01	08
	146	18A	0	01	93
	145	5A	0	00	40
	146	15B	0	00	40
	146	16	0	01	95
	146	13	0	01	07
	146	12B	0	01	63
	145	4	0	00	81
	145	2A	0	01	28
	145	1A	0	03	51
	146	11	0	00	64
	144	11	0	00	40
	144	12	0	02	66
	144	13	0	02	47
	144	27	0	07	14
	144	5A	0	00	91
	152	12B	0	03	62
	152	12A	0	02	16
	152	6D	0	01	81
	152	8	0	00	75
	160	5	0	00	69
	160	4	0	00	85

1	2	3	4	5	6
	160	3	0	01	53
	160	2	0	02	17
	160	1	0	05	55
	159	9B	0	02	95
	159	9A	0	03	11
	159	7A	0	00	40
	159	8B	0	04	21
	159	2	0	14	22
	159	4	0	00	40
	158	2	0	04	15
	162	1	0	00	40
	158	16	0	01	22
	158	14	0	01	42
	158	13	0	01	67
	158	11	0	04	69
	158	1B2	0	00	42
	158	7	0	01	92
	158	6	0	01	07
	158	5	0	03	70
	158	4	0	04	28
	158	3	0	03	80
	157	8	0	05	87
	157	6B	0	03	49
	157	5	0	03	86
	157	4	0	06	84
	157	3	0	09	53
	186	17	0	04	41
	186	16	0	05	16
	186	13	0	03	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
	186	12	0	04	99
	186	9	0	00	40
	186	8	0	03	50
	186	3	0	00	43
	186	2B	0	01	15
	186	2A	0	03	23
	186	7	0	02	90
	190	16	0	01	08
	190	15	0	01	36
	190	14A	0	01	63
	190	12C	0	01	96
	190	12A	0	01	81
	190	9	0	02	64
	190	6	0	02	77
	190	5	0	00	40
	190	2	0	12	22
	190	1B	0	01	61
	191	5	0	14	51
NO.130 IRIYUR	279	15	0	11	01
	279	14	0	08	32
	279	13	0	09	04
	279	9	0	05	39
	279	8	0	04	42
	279	7	0	01	59
	279	4	0	00	60
	279	1	0	03	96
	279	3	0	00	40
	277	13	0	10	23
	277	14	0	08	32

1	2	3	4	5	6
	277	10	0	03	34
	276	1	0	10	73
	251	4	0	06	03
	251	1E	0	07	09
	251	1D	0	03	58
	251	1C	0	03	62
	251	1B	0	04	72
	251	1A	0	03	29
	252	13E	0	04	61
	252	13D	0	08	34
	252	12C	0	00	40
	252	12A	0	06	44
	252	12B	0	00	69
	252	8	0	01	01
	252	9	0	14	42
	254	2	0	15	81
	254	1B	0	21	30
	260	24	0	04	18
	260	23B	0	08	60
	260	19	0	07	45
	260	18	0	07	67
	260	16B	0	07	28
	260	15	0	07	30
	259	1	0	01	68
	260	25	0	02	90
	265	5	0	04	41
	265	14	0	06	26
	265	6B	0	00	44
	265	8	0	03	90

1	2	3	4	5	6
	265	11A	0	00	40
	265	4C	0	02	97
	265	10A	0	03	13
	265	10B	0	00	40
	265	3C	0	00	66
	265	9A	0	02	97
	265	9B	0	02	83
	266	7B	0	01	14
	266	7A	0	02	00
	266	6A	0	01	39
	266	6B	0	06	69
	270	4C	0	02	20
	269	12	0	06	75
	270	5	0	07	24
	270	4A	0	08	87
	270	1	0	21	47
	270	2	0	16	75
	150	2	0	19	21
	149	1A	0	03	57
	149	1B	0	15	64
	149	2	0	01	27
	148	7	0	09	52
	147	6	0	20	34
	147	5C	0	07	73
	147	5B	0	07	61
	147	5A	0	02	26
	146	3B	0	06	81
	146	2	0	11	31

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	1	0	10	61
	145	3	0	02	32
	335	4	0	07	16
	335	3A	0	14	37
	341	2D	0	11	49
	341	2C	0	08	12
	341	3	0	00	40
	341	1D	0	01	69
	341	1C	0	12	20
	341	1B	0	02	85
	341	1A	0	05	79
	343	1	0	15	42
	343	2	0	20	15
	344	5A	0	08	50
	344	5B	0	00	40
	344	4A	0	07	49
	344	3A	0	07	50
	345	1	0	27	44
NO. 129 KARUNGULI	174	6	0	14	28
	174	5	0	12	23
	174	2B	0	08	96
	174	2A	0	02	78
	174	1	0	14	38
	173	4B	0	09	04
	173	3B	0	06	55
	173	2B	0	07	31
	173	1B	0	03	49
	166	1B	0	12	67

1	2	3	4	5	6
	166	1A2	0	00	53
	164	8C	0	09	14
	164	7	0	11	27
	164	3	0	15	88
	111	4B	0	06	89
	111	4A	0	06	65
	111	3A	0	12	81
	111	3B	0	00	73
	111	2C	0	05	63
	111	2D	0	01	53
	111	2B	0	04	51
	111	2A	0	00	40
	113	20H	0	01	19
	113	20D	0	02	39
	113	20C	0	04	13
	113	20B	0	02	69
	113	20A	0	02	24
	123	2A	0	02	01
	146	2	0	01	96
	146	1B	0	03	56
	146	1A	0	05	32
	147	3B	0	00	40
	145	3	0	01	25
	145	4	0	01	91
	145	2	0	03	68
	144	4	0	05	65
	144	1	0	04	70
	140	4	0	03	76
	140	5	0	05	10
	129	1C	0	00	76

1	2	3	4	5	6
	139	-	0	12	95
	135	22	0	00	79
	135	20B	0	03	08
	135	21	0	02	73
	135	16	0	00	40
	134	9	0	02	15
	134	8	0	07	72
	134	1	0	00	40
	134	2	0	01	57
	134	6	0	02	00
	134	5	0	00	62
	134	4	0	00	40
	134	3	0	00	40
	134	7	0	04	98
	49	14	0	00	40
	50	4	0	03	50
	50	3	0	06	00
	50	6	0	02	38
	50	2	0	00	98
	50	5	0	04	52
NO. 127 AMMAKALATTUR	143	6	0	01	40
	143	5	0	02	67
	144	3	0	04	28
	146	7	0	05	02
	146	6	0	02	94
	146	5	0	02	92
	146	3	0	04	65
	146	9	0	01	12
	146	8	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	146	2	0	02	74
	161	2	0	00	41
	161	3	0	19	90
	157	1	0	07	18
	157	2	0	00	40
	160	6	0	01	70
	158	1A	0	20	92
	158	1B	0	00	50
	159	9B	0	10	69
	159	8B	0	00	40
	159	8C	0	04	35
	154	5	0	01	39
	154	3A	0	05	00
	159	10	0	04	99
	159	6	0	07	88
	189	1C	0	00	40
	189	3	0	06	87
	189	4A	0	04	33
	189	4B1	0	00	40
	189	2	0	02	43
	190	2	0	09	75
	190	1D	0	01	47
	190	1B	0	06	36
	190	1C	0	06	16
	187	7	0	08	50
	187	14	0	05	58
	187	5	0	07	91
	187	13	0	01	02

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.128 SEMBAKURICHCHI	195	2	0	02	74
	195	3	0	13	88
	195	4	0	04	05
	176	3A	0	10	27
	176	2	0	09	20
	176	1	0	07	91
	171	9	0	09	54
	171	6	0	03	17
	171	8	0	18	08
	171	7	0	10	34
	171	1	0	10	04
	172	1	0	03	82
NO.126 TEN SIRUVALLUR	60	2	0	00	53
	61	6	0	02	18
	61	4	0	02	35
	62	2	0	12	21
	61	2	0	09	66
	61	1	0	03	65
	62	1	0	06	31
	63	1	0	00	40
	63	3	0	23	77
	69	3	0	10	46
	69	4	0	03	22
	69	5	0	04	77
	69	6	0	04	70
	70	1	0	17	08
	71	5	0	21	02
	71	3	0	10	58
	196	2A	0	12	71

1	2	3	4	5	6
	196	1A	0	07	75
	197	3	0	05	44
	197	2	0	13	34
	197	4	0	08	92
	198	2	0	10	28
	198	3	0	04	30
	198	1	0	16	14
	199	2	0	10	54
	203	2	0	04	67
NO.116 ANUMANANDAL	31	6	0	07	24
	31	9	0	16	32
	31	10	0	07	66
	32	9	0	05	52
	32	8	0	18	08
	32	4	0	10	13
NO.117 NAYINNARPALAYAM	126	3	0	19	71
	127	1	0	03	27
	128	5	0	01	94
	128	6	0	21	27
	130	4	0	05	16
	129	4	0	04	16
	130	5	0	03	01
	130	6	0	00	56
	130	2	0	10	29
	141	6	0	01	74
	141	7	0	01	36
	141	3	0	12	12
	140	3A	0	12	43
	138	4B2	0	01	80

1	2	3	4	5	6
	138	4B1	0	01	66
	139	5B	0	00	40
	138	4A	0	04	55
	138	3B	0	05	74
	138	13	0	00	40
	138	3A	0	07	41
	138	11B	0	04	52
	138	2D	0	00	40
	138	9	0	00	40
	138	11A	0	01	93
	138	12	0	08	07
	137	3F	0	05	35
	137	3E	0	03	64
	137	3D	0	03	73
	137	3C	0	01	35
	158	1	0	07	71
	99	12E	0	02	98
	99	8B	0	00	40
	99	12D	0	03	00
	99	8A	0	18	81
	162	6	0	05	22
	99	7	0	00	40
	162	5	0	04	72
	163	3	0	14	53
	163	2	0	12	27
	163	5B	0	01	38
	163	5A	0	10	49
	165	4	0	15	37
	165	5	0	00	40

	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	50	0	165	10B	0	15 04
23	00	0	171	14	0	10 24
24	00	0	171	7	0	03 73
25	22	0	171	12	0	06 78
26	20	0	171	5	0	05 76
27	21	0	172	6	0	18 34
28	40	0	172	5	0	09 18
29	50	0	172	3	0	08 69
30	01	0	176	1	0	06 34
31	50	0	176	2	0	10 41
32	40	0	178	4	0	12 71
33	11	0	178	6	0	05 34
34	50	0	178	7	0	00 61
35	00	0	178	5	0	04 82
36	00	0	179	3	0	06 85
37	00	0	179	1	0	03 41
38	50	0	179	5	0	03 49
39	20	0	180	2	0	16 17
40	00	0	181	10	0	17 73
41	00	0	181	2	0	05 31
42	01	0	196	1	0	01 03
43	00	0	196	3	0	02 41
44	30	0	219	1	0	28 90
45	11	0	219	8	0	01 90
46	00	0	219	5	0	21 49
47	00	0	218	8A	0	04 89
48	40	0	218	7	0	10 36
49	01	0	218	1B	0	16 54
			218	1A	0	00 40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	215	1C	0	02	69
	215	1B	0	00	97
	215	1A	0	06	24
	215	2	0	35	29
	212	1	0	05	01
	212	2	0	16	66
	212	3	0	04	47
NO.106 PETTASAMUDRAM	2	1C	0	03	88
	2	1B	0	19	11
	2	2B	0	02	38
	2	1A	0	04	57
	2	4	0	11	70
	2	5	0	02	11
	1	5A3	0	09	42
	1	5A4A	0	09	29
	1	4B	0	00	73
	1	4A	0	02	68
	1	3B	0	05	37
	1	3A	0	00	70
	6	4	0	05	65
	5	1	0	09	67
	6	1A	0	19	08
	6	9	0	09	00
	13	1A	0	08	95
	19	4	0	11	32
	19	6B	0	00	40
	19	6A	0	00	40
	19	8	0	04	11
	19	2	0	10	86

1	2	3	4	5	6
	22	1	0	07	65
	24	6	0	05	90
	24	5	0	05	16
	24	4	0	06	64
	24	3A	0	05	29
	24	2B	0	03	56
	24	2A	0	02	07
	24	1A	0	01	99
	30	5	0	04	00
	30	4	0	05	93
	30	3	0	07	14
	30	2	0	05	03
	30	1	0	06	38
	34	5	0	04	53
	34	4	0	04	47
	34	3B	0	03	17
	34	3A	0	01	31
	34	2B	0	02	49
	34	2A	0	03	99
	34	1C2	0	00	40
	35	11A	0	04	56
	35	11B	0	01	85
	35	10	0	05	12
	35	9	0	09	63
	35	8	0	04	63
	35	7	0	04	57
	35	4	0	03	11
	35	5	0	04	18
	55	7B	0	00	64

1	2	3	4	5	6
	55	8A	0	11	85
	55	3	0	00	57
	55	5	0	04	17
	55	4	0	03	99
	55	6	0	00	41
	56	3	0	03	45
	56	2	0	00	69
	56	8	0	03	29
	56	9	0	00	95
	57	10B	0	05	48
	57	7	0	01	38
	57	10A	0	07	83
	76	4C	0	00	40
	76	5	0	03	69
	76	6	0	06	20
	77	1	0	02	00
	83	4	0	01	90
	88	-	0	00	40
	87	4	0	13	31
	87	3	0	03	94
	87	1	0	03	07
	86	2	0	02	72
	86	1	0	04	10
	90	5A	0	00	63
	90	6	0	01	82
	90	1	0	00	40
	90	8	0	02	50
	91	12	0	01	35

0	01	A	2	3	4	5	6
0A	50	0	91	10	0	01	50
1P	85	0	91	9	0	01	46
0A	00	0	91	8C	0	02	24
10	20	0	91	8D	0	00	71
07	20	0	91	11	0	01	18
2A	81	0	91	7	0	01	10
4B	50	0	91	5	0	00	40
6A	01	0	93	1A	0	00	57
80	20	0	192	1	0	19	03
05	20	0	191	5	0	04	61
11	05	0	191	6A	0	07	60
80	21	0	191	6B	0	01	85
04	31	0	191	7A	0	00	42
20	20	0	191	7B	0	13	46
20	20	0	191	8B	0	16	05
06	81	0	189	3	0	02	59
12	50	0	189	4	0	30	12
08	81	0	189	5D	0	05	88
22	20	0	189	5C	0	07	49
50	21	0	189	5B	0	02	49
00	50	0	189	5A	0	00	40
10	80	0	190	81	0	06	53
20	50	0	190	21	0	14	04
24	50	0	190	31	0	06	77
02	50	0	190	1C	0	01	95
NO 104 DATTADRIPURAM	50	0	93	8A1	0	03	72
01	10	0	93	3A1	0	11	57
31	50	0	91	3A2	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	9	6A	0	02	40
	9	6B	0	24	91
	8	4C	0	00	40
	8	4B	0	02	37
	8	4A	0	03	70
	8	3B	0	18	83
	8	1B	0	07	83
	8	2A	0	10	26
	24	5	0	09	06
	24	3A	0	03	20
	24	3B	0	20	11
NO.103 KALLASAMUDRAM	1	8	0	13	06
	2	4	0	17	46
	1	3C	0	03	39
	2	5B	0	01	08
	2	6	0	14	80
	5	2B	0	07	67
	5	1B	0	14	33
	6	2B	0	05	88
	6	5B	0	07	93
	6	1A	0	13	03
	12	10C	0	02	90
	12	10B	0	04	67
	12	10D	0	02	65
	12	9B	0	02	46
	12	9A	0	02	98
	12	8B	0	02	34
	12	8A	0	01	29
	12	7	0	07	36

1	2	3	4	5	6
	12	3	0	07	00
	12	10H	0	00	40
	12	6	0	02	14
	12	5C	0	00	40
	12	5B	0	00	70
	12	10I	0	01	69
	15	12B	0	05	95
	15	12A	0	06	35
	15	11	0	02	85
	15	15	0	02	92
	15	14	0	02	57
	15	13	0	02	69
	15	10	0	07	78
	10	8	0	00	40
	10	7	0	00	67
	10	6	0	01	14
	10	5	0	04	39
	15	9	0	00	40
	10	2	0	06	51
	27	5	0	07	70
	27	4	0	04	00
	27	11	0	04	30
	27	10	0	04	65
	27	9	0	04	88
	30	1D	0	03	33
	31	6C2	0	00	40
	31	10	0	00	64
	31	11	0	00	96
	30	1E	0	03	99

1	2	3	4	5	6
	30	1C	0	03	27
	30	1B	0	04	01
	31	4B	0	03	06
	31	4A1	0	03	70
	39	-	0	11	25
	38	6	0	01	58
	38	8	0	11	00
	38	7A	0	00	40
	38	7B	0	08	84
	37	3	0	00	40
	37	2	0	01	05
	37	1	0	02	26
	36	3	0	01	92
	36	2B	0	02	02
	34	10	0	01	45
	36	2A	0	01	36
	36	1	0	03	24
	35	7	0	10	43
	35	9A2	0	00	62
	35	9A1	0	00	40
	35	6B	0	01	87
	35	6C	0	02	00
	35	8	0	04	10
	48	16	0	01	84
	48	17B	0	03	16
	48	17A	0	04	42
	48	18	0	00	48
	49	1B4	0	05	96
	49	1B3	0	10	17

1	2	3	4	5	6
	49	1B5	0	00	45
	50	3B2	0	14	77
	50	9	0	02	20
	50	4	0	01	56
	50	3B1	0	01	50
	50	3A3	0	05	29
	50	3A2	0	00	48
	50	3A1	0	02	78
NO.102 DAGAMTIRTTAPURAM	205	3	0	10	58
	205	1	0	20	28
	206	3B	0	01	10
	206	3A	0	21	69
	206	1B	0	03	36
	206	1A	0	03	84
	208	5	0	05	28
	208	4	0	04	31
	208	3	0	07	73
	208	2	0	04	05
	208	1	0	04	54
	198	8	0	05	19
	198	10	0	02	79
	198	6	0	05	27
	198	5	0	02	27
	199	6	0	01	03
	198	4	0	02	46
	198	3	0	04	86
	199	8	0	04	60
	198	2	0	01	08
	199	7	0	12	02

1	2	3	4	5	6
	196	3	0	08	54
	196	2	0	07	74
	196	1	0	09	61
	225	3	0	12	00
	225	2	0	10	52
	225	13	0	06	85
	225	11	0	01	36
	225	1	0	03	47
	226	1	0	05	37
	168	-	0	21	34
	162	20B	0	01	05
	160	11B	0	05	97
	160	10	0	12	38
	160	9	0	02	05
	160	8	0	02	14
	160	7	0	02	26
	160	6	0	02	15
	160	4	0	02	60
	160	3B	0	02	59
	160	3A	0	01	01
	160	1	0	11	25
	158	4C	0	07	21
	158	4D	0	09	16
	158	12B	0	00	40
	158	4B	0	00	64
	248	9B	0	01	97
	248	9A	0	06	24
	248	7B	0	02	48
	248	9C	0	00	54

1	2	3	4	5	6
	248	7C	0	03	76
	248	9D	0	00	57
	248	9E	0	01	64
	248	5	0	00	40
	248	7A	0	03	97
	248	8	0	00	40
	249	5C1	0	06	84
	249	5C2	0	01	87
	249	5D1B	0	05	79
	249	5D2	0	01	23
	249	5D1A	0	01	50
NO.101 PUNDI	75	2	0	16	93
	76	5	0	09	33
	76	4	0	00	69
	76	2	0	03	92
	77	10	0	13	39
	77	11	0	01	23
	77	1	0	00	60
	77	9	0	29	83
NO.99 RAYAPPANUR	376	10	0	19	43
	376	13	0	11	90
	376	9	0	03	83

[No. R-25011/17/2004-O.R.-I]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1740.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि तमिलनाडु राज्य में चेन्नई से तिरुच्चि, मदुराई और शंकरी तक पेट्रोलियम उत्पादन के परिवहन के लिए इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए

और ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस

दिन के भीतर भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रति लिखित रूप में आक्षेप श्री .आर. वज्रवेलू, सक्षम प्राधिकारी चेन्नई - तिरुचिरापल्ली - मदुराई उत्पाद पाइपलाइन परियोजना और आसनूर से शंकरी तक ब्रांच पाइपलाइन परियोजना, 4/2, आरोकियासामी स्ट्रीट, क्राफोर्ड कालोनी, तिरुचिरापल्ली - 620012 (तमिलनाडु) को कर सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालुका : अम्बलूर		जिला : तिरुवल्लूर		राज्य : तमिलनाडु	
गौव का नाम	सर्वे नंबर	हिस्सा नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	वर्ग मीटर
1	2	3	4	5	6
सदरनामा (थिरुवोटियूर टाऊन)		वार्ड डि ब्लाक 1 टि एस 4	0	70	65
नं. 41 गवालि		वार्ड डि ब्लाक 1 टि एस 3	0	04	24
	258	5	0	10	45
	258	4अ	0	13	65
	258	3अ1	0	02	56
	258	3अ2	0	03	20
	258	3अ3	0	03	18
	258	3ब	0	04	83
	253	1ब	0	20	90
	253	1अ	0	05	21
	127	2ब3	0	00	40
	116	9	0	08	24
	116	8	0	06	08
	116	4	0	04	64
	116	3	0	05	07
	115	5	0	06	45
	115	4	0	04	34
	115	1	0	10	38
	113	7	0	07	80
	113	6	0	07	86
	84	4	0	07	58
	84	3	0	00	40
	85	6	0	05	19
	85	4	0	03	62
		3	0	00	62
		12	0	02	10
		10	0	04	06
		0	0	01	72
		0	07	81	

1	2	3	4	5	6
	89	6	0	12	42
	89	4	0	11	08
	99	12	0	06	24
	99	11	0	04	78
	99	13	0	00	48
	99	9	0	02	29
	99	10	0	03	30
	100	-	0	16	65
	97	4	0	00	40
	58	1ब	0	02	40
	58	13अ	0	10	33
	61	3	0	07	03
	61	2	0	17	42
	61	1	0	10	53
	62	3	0	06	32
	62	4	0	10	65
	62	1	0	08	38
	65	1ब	0	07	49
	65	13अ	0	13	42
	65	33अ	0	02	73
	64	4	0	09	31
	64	2	0	09	11
	8	1ब	0	10	28
	8	13अ	0	08	40
	9	3ब	0	14	33
	9	33अ	0	13	08
	10	5	0	13	66
	10	1ब	0	15	30
	10	13अ	0	00	89
	62	5	0	16	42
	62	4	0	00	40
	62	3	0	01	87
	62	2	0	05	32
	61	1	0	09	87
	55	7	0	06	42
	57	1	0	00	40
	46	2	0	08	08
	46	6	0	14	45

नं. 28 अरियलूर

1	2	3	4	5	6
	45	3	0	13	69
	45	2	0	10	65
	39		0	21	38
	43	1	0	13	86
	41	5	0	00	75
	41	3	0	09	13
	41	1	0	10	51

तालूका : पोन्नेरि	जिला : तिरुवल्लूर		राज्य : तमिलनाडु		
नं 150 विचूर	396	5	0	15	42
	396	3	0	07	88
	396	2	0	02	73
	395	4	0	05	62
	395	3	0	07	12
	395	2अ	0	03	95
	394	6ब	0	01	75
	394	4	0	12	26
	394	3	0	09	69
	360	3	0	01	57
	360	2क	0	04	57
	360	2ब	0	03	22
	360	2अ	0	00	76
	360	1	0	03	65
	361	8	0	01	57
	361	9	0	10	72
	361	5	0	01	38
	361	4	0	04	30
	361	1	0	04	37
	363	2अ	0	00	77
	362	3	0	00	40
	362	2ब	0	12	49
	362	2अ	0	07	82
	358	1	0	00	78
	352	7	0	00	55
	352	5	0	06	47
	352	8	0	06	99
	352	1क	0	07	61

1	2	3	4	5	6
नं 121 पेरुंगवूर	352	1ब	0	00	40
	372	2	0	13	34
	373	1	0	12	81
	380	-	0	03	72
	375	2	0	04	00
	375	1	0	08	12
	378	-	0	06	44
	377	3क	0	04	71
	377	3ब	0	11	62
	377	3अ	0	02	62
	400	2	0	06	21
	400	13अ	0	00	57
	397	2	0	03	61
	397	1	0	10	67
	398	-	0	10	90
	395	1	0	07	34
	414	2	0	15	79
	412	1	0	00	91
	414	1	0	15	38
	429	2	0	08	15
	429	1	0	07	23
	428	-	0	07	35
	431	23अ	0	08	69
	431	1ब	0	01	14
	442	2	0	06	57
	442	1	0	10	81
	458	2	0	09	29
	458	1	0	06	55
	459	2ब	0	03	93
	459	23अ	0	03	98
	459	1	0	08	95
	456	-	0	00	65
	460	-	0	01	72
	461	-	0	04	82
	453	2	0	09	71
	452	2	0	17	30
	481	2	0	08	57
	481	1	0	07	05

1	2	3	4	5	6
	479	2	0	16	72
	479	1	0	00	40
	478	3	0	08	39
	478	1	0	06	38
	478	2	0	07	05
	478	4	0	06	46
	544	2	0	09	04
	543	-	0	09	12
	544	1	0	05	05
	545	2	0	13	03
	547	2	0	01	11
	547	1ब	0	10	59
	547	13अ1ब	0	10	66
	547	13अ13अ	0	00	55
	547	13अ2	0	00	40
	557	-	0	11	95
	556	1	0	09	22
	562	2	0	14	59
	562	13अ	0	01	03
	565	-	0	06	59
	564	-	0	18	49
	572	1	0	06	71
	572	2	0	09	13
	573	2	0	00	71
	573	1	0	13	07
नं 123 कुम्भनूर	81	-	0	11	53
	80	3	0	24	09
	80	4	0	11	36
	80	23अ	0	01	57
	80	1	0	12	24
	79	2ब	0	03	00
	79	23अ	0	04	60
	79	1क	0	01	73
	79	1ब	0	06	63
	79	13अ	0	03	35
	74	13अ	0	03	99
	75	1	0	22	38
	68	2ब	0	05	13

1	2	3	4	5	6
	68	2अ	0	04	23
	68	1अ	0	13	34
	76	2अ	0	01	32
	3	3	0	02	49
	67	-	0	10	05
	3	1क	0	11	92
	3	4	0	05	12
	3	1ब2ब	0	03	03
	4	1ड	0	16	02
	3	1ब2अ	0	00	40
	4	1क	0	08	91
	4	2अ1	0	07	13
	4	1ब	0	12	64
	4	1अ	0	05	78
	5	4	0	03	15
	5	3	0	12	31
	6	5	0	03	02
	5	2	0	28	92
नं 124 अंगाडु	24	1	0	26	94
	29	1	0	05	04
	22	1	0	23	74
	19	2इ	0	12	52
	19	2ड	0	11	04
	19	2क	0	10	34
	19	2ब	0	06	62
	19	2अ	0	00	40
	5	-	0	15	56
	9	3	0	09	88
	9	2ब	0	05	87
	9	2अ	0	01	30
	9	1	0	09	31
	8	3	0	04	82
	285	1	0	04	62
	287	4	0	11	63
	287	3	0	04	83
	287	2क	0	06	76
	287	2ब	0	00	64
	287	1	0	17	63

1	2	3	4	5	6
	288	1	0	10	34
नं 125 ओरक्काडु	58	2ब	0	09	39
	58	2अ	0	11	00
	58	1	0	22	46
	57	3	0	13	56
	50	3अ	0	01	68
	50	2अ2	0	07	33
	50	1अ2	0	08	80
	50	1अ1	0	01	26
	49	2ड1	0	02	42
	49	2क	0	09	00
	49	2ब	0	01	57
	48	2ब	0	12	28
	47	4	0	10	70
	47	3ब	0	07	86
	47	3अ	0	13	65
	46	3	0	06	08
	46	1ब	0	05	01
	46	1अ	0	07	30
नं 104 सोतुपेरुबेडु	232	1ब	0	07	76
	232	1अ	0	08	76
	231	2ब	0	09	18
	231	1ब	0	08	36
	230	3ब3	0	07	70
	230	3ब2	0	00	72
	230	2ब2	0	00	40
	230	2ब1	0	01	53
	230	3ब1	0	05	21
	230	3अ	0	17	34
	162	-	0	06	97
	161	-	0	12	16
	109	3ब	0	07	11
	109	1	0	06	51
	108	1अ	0	07	01
	108	1ब	0	05	24
	108	2ब	0	03	39

1	2	3	4	5	6
	108	2अ	0	01	38
	108	2क	0	04	41
	107	2इ	0	04	54
	107	2उ	0	01	76
	107	2ब	0	02	39
	107	1	0	09	88
	85	1	0	08	10
	85	2	0	11	00
	84	-	0	05	05
	83	-	0	04	28
	80	8	0	06	32
	79	-	0	01	12
	80	7	0	04	36
	78	2	0	01	08
	78	3	0	03	04
	80	6	0	02	75
	80	5	0	06	33
	80	1	0	15	11
	80	2अ	0	00	70
नं 116 चोलवरम	27	3	0	04	58
	27	2	0	11	15
	27	1	0	04	84
	28	4ब	0	03	35
	28	4अ	0	01	84
	345	-	0	01	04
	344	-	0	00	81
	339	11	0	08	85
	339	12	0	07	09
	339	9	0	10	24
	339	10	0	04	54
	339	8क	0	00	40
	467	7	0	06	12
	467	5ब	0	03	67
	467	5अ	0	09	94
	471	2ब	0	13	45
	471	2अ	0	05	02
	465	1अ2अ	0	04	10
	465	1अ2ब	0	00	42

1	2	3	4	5	6
	472	4ब	0	10	00
	478	5	0	06	44
	478	4ब	0	18	15
	478	2अ	0	01	97
	478	2ब	0	04	64
	487	-	0	01	55
	485	6अ	0	03	53
	485	13अ4	0	05	14
	485	4	0	06	66
	485	2	0	10	39
	485	13अ5	0	02	74
	485	13अ2	0	04	45
	485	13अ3	0	02	85
	485	1ब	0	00	40
	534	5अ	0	12	22
	534	5ब	0	01	91
	517	1	0	07	40
	499	4क	0	01	07
	517	3ब	0	06	84
	517	3अ	0	02	99
	521	1अ	0	00	90
	515 ब	3क1	0	00	40
	515 ब	2क	0	02	33
	515 ब	1ब3	0	01	90
	515 अ	2	0	07	92
	515 अ	6	0	03	24

[फा. सं. आर-25011/18/2004-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1740.— Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of petroleum products from Chennai to Trichy, Madurai and Sankari in the State of Tamilnadu, a pipeline should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And, whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land)

Act.1962(50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person, interested in the land described in the said Schedule may within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of this notification as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri. R.Vajravelu, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Chennai-Trichy-Madurai Product Pipeline Project with a branch pipeline from Asanur to Sankari, 4/2, Arockiasamy Street, Crawford Colony, Tiruchirappalli-620 012, Tamilnadu.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Ambattur	District : Tiruvallur		State : Tamil Nadu		
Name of the Village	Survey no.	Sub-Division no.	Area		
			Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr.
1	2	3	4	5	6
SATTANKADU (THIRUVOTTIYUR TOWN)	Ward D Block 1 TS 4	-	0	70	65
	Ward D Block 1 TS 3	-	0	04	24
NO.41 MANALI	258	5	0	10	45
	258	4A	0	13	65
	258	3A1	0	02	56
	258	3A2	0	03	20
	258	3A3	0	03	18
	258	3B	0	04	83
	253	1B	0	20	90
	253	1A	0	05	21
	127	2B3	0	00	40
	116	9	0	08	24
	116	8	0	06	08
	116	4	0	04	64
	116	3	0	05	07
	115	5	0	06	45
	115	4	0	04	34
	115	1	0	10	38
	113	7	0	07	80

1	2	3	4	5	6
	113	6	0	07	86
	84	4	0	07	58
	84	3	0	00	40
	85	6	0	05	19
	85	4	0	03	62
	85	3	0	00	62
	89	12	0	02	10
	89	10	0	04	06
	89	8	0	01	72
	89	11	0	07	81
	89	6	0	12	42
	89	4	0	11	08
	99	12	0	06	24
	99	11	0	04	78
	99	13	0	00	48
	99	9	0	02	29
	99	10	0	03	30
	100	-	0	16	65
	97	4	0	00	40
	58	1B	0	02	40
	58	1A	0	10	33
	61	3	0	07	03
	61	2	0	17	42
	61	1	0	10	53
	62	3	0	06	32
	62	4	0	10	65
	62	1	0	08	38
	65	1B	0	07	49
	65	1A	0	13	42
	65	3A	0	02	73
	64	4	0	09	31
	64	2	0	09	11
	8	1B	0	10	28
	8	1A	0	08	40
	9	3B	0	14	33
	9	3A	0	13	08
	10	5	0	13	66
	10	1B	0	15	30
	10	1A	0	00	89
NO.28 ARIYALUR	62	5	0	16	42
	62	4	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5	6
	62	3	0	01	87
	62	2	0	05	32
	61	1	0	09	87
	55	7	0	06	42
	57	1	0	00	40
	46	2	0	08	08
	46	6	0	14	45
	45	3	0	13	69
	45	2	0	10	65
	39	-	0	21	38
	43	1	0	13	86
	41	5	0	00	75
	41	3	0	09	13
	41	1	0	10	51

Taluk : Ponneri	District : Tiruvallur		State : Tamil Nadu		
NO.150 VICHUR	396	5	0	15	42
	396	3	0	07	88
	396	2	0	02	73
	395	4	0	05	62
	395	3	0	07	12
	395	2A	0	03	95
	394	6B	0	01	75
	394	4	0	12	26
	394	3	0	09	69
	360	3	0	01	57
	360	2C	0	04	57
	360	2B	0	03	22
	360	2A	0	00	76
	360	1	0	03	65
	361	8	0	01	57
	361	9	0	10	72
	361	5	0	01	38
	361	4	0	04	30
	361	1	0	04	37
	363	2A	0	00	77
	362	3	0	00	40
	362	2B	0	12	49
	362	2A	0	07	82
	358	1	0	00	78
	352	7	0	00	55
	352	5	0	06	47

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.121 PERUNGAVOOR	352	8	0	06	99
	352	1C	0	07	61
	352	1B	0	00	40
	372	2	0	13	34
	373	1	0	12	81
	380	-	0	03	72
	375	2	0	04	00
	375	1	0	08	12
	378	-	0	06	44
	377	3C	0	04	71
	377	3B	0	11	62
	377	3A	0	02	62
	400	2	0	06	21
	400	1A	0	00	57
	397	2	0	03	61
	397	1	0	10	67
	398	-	0	10	90
	395	1	0	07	34
	414	2	0	15	79
	412	1	0	00	91
	414	1	0	15	38
	429	2	0	08	15
	429	1	0	07	23
	428	-	0	07	35
	431	2A	0	08	69
	431	1B	0	01	14
	442	2	0	06	57
	442	1	0	10	81
	458	2	0	09	29
	458	1	0	06	55
	459	2B	0	03	93
	459	2A	0	03	98
	459	1	0	08	95
	456	-	0	00	65
	460	-	0	01	72
	461	-	0	04	82
	453	2	0	09	71
	452	2	0	17	30
	481	2	0	08	57
	481	1	0	07	05

1	2	3	4	5	6
	479	2	0	16	72
	479	1	0	00	40
	478	3	0	08	39
	478	1	0	06	38
	478	2	0	07	05
	478	4	0	06	46
	544	2	0	09	04
	543	-	0	09	12
	544	1	0	05	05
	545	2	0	13	03
	547	2	0	01	11
	547	1B	0	10	59
	547	1A1B	0	10	66
	547	1A1A	0	00	55
	547	1A2	0	00	40
	557	-	0	11	95
	556	1	0	09	22
	562	2	0	14	59
	562	1A	0	01	03
	565	-	0	06	59
	564	-	0	18	49
	572	1	0	06	71
	572	2	0	09	13
	573	2	0	00	71
	573	1	0	13	07
NO.123 KUMMANUR	81	-	0	11	53
	80	3	0	24	09
	80	4	0	11	36
	80	2A	0	01	57
	80	1	0	12	24
	79	2B	0	03	00
	79	2A	0	04	60
	79	1C	0	01	73
	79	1B	0	06	63
	79	1A	0	03	35
	74	1A	0	03	99
	75	1	0	22	38
	68	2B	0	05	13

1	2	3	4	5	6
	68	2A	0	04	23
	68	1A	0	13	34
	76	2A	0	01	32
	3	3	0	02	49
	67	-	0	10	05
	3	1C	0	11	92
	3	4	0	05	12
	3	1B2B	0	03	03
	4	1D	0	16	02
	3	1B2A	0	00	40
	4	1C	0	08	91
	4	2A1	0	07	13
	4	1B	0	12	64
	4	1A	0	05	78
	5	4	0	03	15
	5	3	0	12	31
	6	5	0	03	02
	5	2	0	28	92
NO.124 ANGADU	24	1	0	26	94
	29	1	0	05	04
	22	1	0	23	74
	19	2E	0	12	52
	19	2D	0	11	04
	19	2C	0	10	34
	19	2B	0	06	62
	19	2A	0	00	40
	5	-	0	15	56
	9	3	0	09	88
	9	2B	0	05	87
	9	2A	0	01	30
	9	1	0	09	31
	8	3	0	04	82
	285	1	0	04	62
	287	4	0	11	63
	287	3	0	04	83
	287	2C	0	06	76
	287	2B	0	00	64
	287	1	0	17	63

1	2	3	4	5	6
NO.125 ORAKKADU	288	1	0	10	34
	58	2B	0	09	39
	58	2A	0	11	00
	58	1	0	22	46
	57	3	0	13	56
	50	3A	0	01	68
	50	2A2	0	07	33
	50	1A2	0	08	80
	50	1A1	0	01	26
	49	2D1	0	02	42
	49	2C	0	09	00
	49	2B	0	01	57
	48	2B	0	12	28
	47	4	0	10	70
	47	3B	0	07	86
	47	3A	0	13	65
	46	3	0	06	08
	46	1B	0	05	01
	46	1A	0	07	30
NO.134 SOTHUPERUMBEDU	234	5	0	01	30
	232	1B	0	07	76
	232	1A	0	08	76
	231	2B	0	09	18
	231	1B	0	08	36
	230	3B3	0	07	70
	230	3B2	0	00	72
	230	2B2	0	00	40
	230	2B1	0	01	53
	230	3B1	0	05	21
	230	3A	0	17	34
	162	-	0	06	97
	161	-	0	12	16
	109	3B	0	07	11
	109	1	0	06	51
	108	1A	0	07	01
	108	1B	0	05	24
	108	2B	0	03	39

1	2	3	4	5	6
	108	2A	0	01	38
	108	2C	0	04	41
	107	2E	0	04	54
	107	2D	0	01	76
	107	2B	0	02	39
	107	1	0	09	88
	85	1	0	08	10
	35	2	0	11	00
	84	-	0	05	05
	83	-	0	04	28
	80	8	0	06	32
	79	-	0	01	12
	80	7	0	04	36
	78	2	0	01	08
	78	3	0	03	04
	80	6	0	02	75
	80	5	0	06	33
	80	1	0	15	11
	80	2A	0	00	70
NO. 16 SRAVANA	27	3	0	04	58
	27	2	0	11	15
	27	1	0	04	84
	28	4B	0	03	35
	28	4A	0	01	84
	345	-	0	01	04
	344	-	0	00	81
	339	11	0	08	85
	339	12	0	07	09
	339	9	0	10	24
	339	10	0	04	54
	339	8C	0	00	40
	467	7	0	06	12
	467	5B	0	03	67
	467	5A	0	09	94
	471	2B	0	13	45
	471	2A	0	05	02
	465	1A2A	0	04	10
		1A2B	0	00	42

1	2	3	4	5	6
	472	4B	0	10	00
	478	5	0	06	44
	478	4B	0	18	15
	478	2A	0	01	97
	478	2B	0	04	64
	487	-	0	01	55
	485	6A	0	03	53
	485	1A4	0	05	14
	485	4	0	06	66
	485	2	0	10	39
	485	1A5	0	02	74
	485	1A2	0	04	45
	485	1A3	0	02	85
	485	1B	0	00	40
	534	5A	0	12	22
	534	5B	0	01	91
	517	1	0	07	40
	499	4C	0	01	07
	517	3B	0	06	84
	517	3A	0	02	99
	521	1A	0	00	90
	515 B	3C1	0	00	40
	515 B	2C	0	02	33
	515 B	1B3	0	01	90
	515 A	2	0	07	92
	515 A	6	0	03	24

[No. R-25011/18/2004-O.R.-II]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1741.— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 467 दिनांक 23.02.2004 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट राजस्थान राज्य की तहसील ब्यावर, जिला अजमेर, की भूमि में, सलाया-मथुरा पाइपलाइन प्रणाली परियोजना के विरमगाम-चाकसू, चाकसू-पानीपत और चाकसू-मथुरा सेक्शनों के संवर्धन के क्रियान्वयन के लिए इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में विरमगाम से राजस्थान राज्य में चाकसू से होकर

हरियाणा राज्य में पानीपत तक अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के लिए अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को दिनांक 15/03/2004 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार इस घोषणा के प्रकाशन की तारीख से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए सभी विल्लिंगमों से मुक्त इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा ।

अनुसूची

तहसील : ब्यावर		जिला : अजमेर		राज्य : राजस्थान	
गाँव का नाम	खसरा सं.	क्षेत्रफल			वर्ग मीटर
		हेक्टेयर	एयर		
1	2	3	4		5
बाड़िया श्यामा	549	0	15		63

[फा. सं. आर-25011/8/2001-ओ.आर-1]

रेणुका कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 2004

S. O. 1741.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas number S.O. 467 dated 23.02.2004 issued under sub section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962): (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land in **Tehsil : Beawar, District : Ajmer** in Rajasthan State, specified in the schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transportation of Crude Oil from Viramgam in the State of Gujarat to Panipat in the State of Haryana via Chaksu in the State of Rajasthan by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited for implementing the Augmentation of Viramgam - Chaksu, Chaksu - Panipat & Chaksu - Mathura sections of Salaya - Mathura Pipeline System Project ;

And whereas, copy of the said notification was made available to the general public on 15/03/2004.

And whereas, the Competent Authority has under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act submitted his report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government, after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this Notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vests from the date of publication of this declaration, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil : BEAWAR		District : AJMER		State : RAJASTHAN	
Name of the Village	Khasara No.	Area			
		Hectare	Are	Sq.mtr	
1	2	3	4	5	
BADIYA GHYANA	549	0	15	63	

● [No. R-25011/8/2001-O.R.-II]
RENUKA KUMAR, Under Secy

श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1742.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसूर मिनेरल्स लि., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण बेंगलोर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 68/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल 29012/197/98-आई. आर. (विविध)]

बी.एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2004

S.O. 1742.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 68/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Mysore Minerals Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 25-06-2004

[No. L-29012/197/98-IR (M)]

B.M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM-LABOUR COURT****Present :**

Shri A.R Siddiqui Presiding Officer

C.R.NO. 68/99

I PARTY

The General Secretary
Mysore Minerals Ltd.
Employees Union,
2nd Cross, 9th Main Road
Gokula 1 Stage, II Phase
Bangalore

II PARTY

The Chairman and
Managing Director,
Mysore Minerals
Limited,
No. 39, M.G. Road,
Bangalore-1

AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-29012/197/98/IR (M), dated 5th May, 1999 for adjudication on the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management in declaring lay-off in 4 chromite mines of Byrapur Division is justified? If not, to what relief the workman are entitled to?"

2. The first party viz. the President, Mysore Minerals Limited, Employees Association (hereinafter called

the first party) filed the Claim Statement with the following averments:—

3. The Mysore Minerals Ltd. is a Government of Karnataka Undertaking. It is running several Mines situated all over the State of Karnataka.
4. The Second party is running several Mines in Chromite Sector with the divisional Headquarters at Byrapur, Hassan District. The following 4 Mines comes under this Division:
 - (a) Thagadur Chromite Mine
 - (b) Jambur Chromite Mine
 - (c) Bhaktharahalli Chromite Mine
 - (d) Aladahalli Chromite Mine

The break up of the workmen under these Mines are given below:—

(a) Thagadur Chromite Mine	290
(b) Jambur Chromite Mine	111
(c) Bhaktharahalli Chromite Mine	143
(d) Aladahalli Chromite Mine	138

Totally in all there are 682 workmen working in these Mines.

5. When the matter stood thus, the Second party by order No. PER/240/GEN/98-99/2504 dated 1-9-98 obtained false reports from the Company's officers (Mining) and Mines Managers of these Mines to the effect that due to heavy rains in the areas comprised in these Mines, Mining operations had become difficult because of water logging of pits and that it was not conducive for continuing the mining operations for another 3 to 4 months affecting closing down of production operations in these mines w.e.f. 1-9-1998. A copy of the Order dated 1-9-1998 together with its enclosures 1 and 3 are herewith produced as Annexure "A".

6. The first party union which is the only majority and representative Trade Union of the workers employed in the Second Party Company in the State and which has been declared as the sole Collective Bargaining Agent in respect of these workers in a Referendum, challenged the stand taken by the Management in the matter and termed the closure of the mines as violative of Section 25-O of the Industrial Disputes Act and termed the lay off of the workers as being violative of Section 25-M of the said Act in that the Company had not applied for and obtained necessary permission from the Central Government which is appropriate Government under the Act to close down these mines and to lay off the workers employed therein. The First party demanded of the Management to reopen these mines and also provide work to these workers. The water logging of pits due to heavy monsoon rains and therefore continuing mining operation these mines will not be possible, is only a ruse to close down the operations in these mines and to lay off the workers. Therefore, neither the closure nor the laying off the workmen in these mines is bonafide and real, but it is a make believe and totally unwarranted and illegal.

7. When the matter was taken up before the Conciliation Officer, viz. the Asstt. Labour Commissioner, Central, the first party Union raised these issue and wanted the Conciliation Officer to direct the Second Party Management to lift the lay off effected on these workmen and permit them to work in these Mines. The Management falsely informed the said Authorities that it had applied for necessary permission in the matter and the same was awaited, but in fact no such permission was sought for. Further, laying off all workmen can be effected under Section 25-M of the Industrial Dispute Act only after receipt of the permission from the appropriate Government and not prior to or in anticipation of the permission. Therefore, laying off 637 workmen w.e.f. 1-9-98 is wholly irregular, arbitrary, *malafide*, illegal and not sustainable in law.

8. Under these circumstances and in view of sub-section 8 of Section 25-M of the Industrial Disputes Act., the laying off these workmen by the second party management w.e.f. 1-9-1998 is deemed to be illegal and all these affected workmen are entitled for all the benefits under any law for the time being in force as if they had not been laid off. In other words, these workers are entitled to be paid full wages and other consequential benefits as if they had not been laid off by the Second Party on and from 1-9-1998.

9. In these circumstances, the first party most respectfully prays that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass an Award holding that the lay off ordered by the Second Party Management in its Order dated 1-9-1998 w.e.f. 01-09-1998 is wholly unwarranted, illegal and unjustified being in violation of the mandatory provisions of Section 25-M of the ID Act and consequently these 637 workmen are entitled to be paid full wages and all other consequential benefits as if they had not been laid off by the Second Party on and from 01-9-1998 and grant such other relief or reliefs as this Hon'ble Tribunal deems it fit to grant in the facts and circumstances of this case, in the interest of justice.

10. The Second Party Management viz. Mysore Minerals Ltd. Bangalore (hereinafter called the management) by its counter statement challenged the claim of the first party contenting among other ground that:

11. The Second Party by order dated 1-9-1998 due to unavoidable circumstances, closed 4 mines temporarily with effect from 1-9-1998. The facts leading to the temporary closure as per the order dated 1-9-98 has been briefly explained in the order by the Second Party. As per the report of the senior surveyor and other officials, because of water logging of pits due to heavy monsoon rain for the last few weeks prior to 1-9-1998 the entire mining area was flooded and it was assessed that the same position would continue for another three to four months as on 26-8-98. There were other allied reasons for ordering the closure of the mines, they were immaterial and negligible when

compared to the mining activities because of the natural calamities, the floods due to heavy monsoon rain. The Second party submits that under Section 25-M of ID Act, no permission from Government is necessary for such temporary closure or lay off which this due to natural calamities and in the case of mines such lay off is due to flood. In this case, as already explained all the four mines had been flooded with heavy monsoon rain and the mines had to be closed with effect from 1-9-98. In these circumstances, the management was justified in doing so. Hence, this Hon'ble court may be pleased to uphold the temporary closure of the mines for the above reasons and reject the reference.

12. The Second Party has paid lay off wages at 50% of the gross salary without any deduction. The details of the payments made for the period 16-9-1998 to 30-11-1999 are as follows:-

Mines	Salary Rs.	Wages Rs.	Total Rs.
Thagadur	4,37,952	5,55,628	9,93,580
Jambur			1,98,327
Aladahalli (Average)			2,18,415
Bhaktirahalli	1,54,351	71,978	2,26,329
Grand Total:			Rs. 16,36,691

13. The second party humbly submits that the first party has no *locus standi* whatsoever to raise the above dispute as it does not command the support of majority employees of the four mines belonging to the second party which is the subject-matter of this dispute. None of the employees of the four mines are members of the first party union. Further, the majority of employees of the second party working in the four mines have not authorized the first party union to raise the dispute on their behalf. In these circumstances, the present dispute referred to this Hon'ble Tribunal is bad in law. Therefore, this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to frame the following two issues and both of them may please be tried as preliminary issues before embarking upon adjudication of main dispute.

14. Whether the first party proves that it has *locus standi* to represent the workmen of four mines of Second Party of Byrapur Division.

15. Whether the first party proves that it is an Industrial Dispute under Section 2 (K) of ID Act, and has the support of majority of workmen of four mines of Byrapur Division.

16. The allegations made in para 4 of the Claim Statement is absolutely unfounded and motivated. The factual position obtained in the mine have been brought to the notice of the Head Office of the Company by the field officers for urgent action to suspend mining operations. Hence, this decision. The Second Party denies

other allegations of the union which are contrary to what is stated above.

17. Regarding para 5 of the Claim Statement, it is submitted that the reference to Section 25 (o) is incorrect as the provisions of the section is not attracted in this, as there were incessant rains and consequently all the working pits were filled with water and hence the decision was taken. The letter or notice intimating the Government/Appropriate Authority regarding the temporary lay off (suspension of work) had been duly intimated. This is to prove that the company had sent intimation after the lay off (within 30 days). All other allegations of the union which are contrary to what is stated above are hereby denied.

18. Regarding para 6 of the Claim Statement, it is vehemently denied that the action of the management is in violation of provisions of Section 25M. Under the special circumstances/situation, the company had to suspend operations involving a lay off and intimate the authorities about such action. The allegation made in the concluding part of para 6 of the union is hereby denied. The company being a State Government undertaking has the best interest of the workers much more than any body to see that they are not to be put into any inconvenience or loss. The action taken was under specific compulsions. The suspension of mining operations/lay off in this case was done under the provisions of sub-sec. 1 of Sec. 25(m) and in the case of the mine such lay off is due also to fire, flood, inflammable gas or explosion. The other allegations of the union which are contrary to what is stated above are hereby denied.

19. Regarding para 7, it is submitted that the provisions of sub-section B of Section 25 (m) does not apply to this case. The action taken by the management in the circumstances was fully justified and such urgent action was called for and the management could not have waited for permission from the Central Government. The other allegations contrary to what is stated above are hereby denied.

20. Regarding para 8, it is submitted that the action taken by the management in declaring lay off due to incessant rains and consequent floods, filling up with water in the working pits and also with continuous seepage of water into the workings pits, was necessary and hence the above decision. The allegation made by the first party is totally baseless. The claim should therefore be dismissed. The other allegations contrary to what is stated above are hereby denied.

21. Therefore, the first party union or the workman are not entitled to any relief whatsoever in the facts and circumstances of the case.

22. From the perusal of the order sheet maintained by this Tribunal, it could be seen that as on 20-8-1999 Claim Statement was filed by the first party and thereafter second party filed its Counter Statement on 8-1-2002. The matter came to be posted for the evidence of the second

party, as burden of proof was cast on it as per the reference point. On 25-3-2004 when the matter was taken up for hearing, the first party remained absent and the learned counsel, Shri K. R. Anand representing the management submitted that in the light of the specific contentions raised by the management in the Counter Statement, the two additional issues are to be framed as indicated at para 5 of the Counter Statement. After hearing the learned counsel and perusing the contentions taken in the Counter Statement, this court on the said date framed the following two issues and there upon they being treated as preliminary issue were taken up for hearing in the first instance.

Issues

(1) Whether the first party proves that, it has *locus standi* to represent the workmen of four mines of second party of Byrapur Division.

(2) Whether the first party proves that it is an Industrial Dispute under Section 2(k) of ID Act, and has the support of majority of workmen of four mines of Byrapur Division.

23. As the first party namely the Union President who raised the present dispute remained absent before this tribunal on many of the dates of hearing, the court to be on safer side thought it proper to take fresh notice to him and accordingly notice was issued by way of RPAD returnable by 25-5-2004. The notice returned back unserved with the report that there was no sufficient address for service earlier to this also notice by RPAD was sent to the first party President returnable by 5-3-04 and that also came to be returned unserved with similar endorsement by the post office concerned. Therefore, on 25-5-04 the court taking note of the fact that notice could not be served upon the first party President though sent under RPAD twice, the reason being insufficient address, felt it unnecessary to take fresh notice against him and since the matter was posted for evidence of the first party on the aforesaid date, it was taken that first party has no evidence on the aforesaid two issues. Then the case was posted for evidence of Second Party, if any, giving the date as 10-6-2004, on which date both the parties remained absent, no evidence was led on behalf of the Second Party also and therefore, the case is posted this day for award. As noted above the aforesaid two additional issues have been framed by this court on the basis of the contentions taken by the management in its Counter Statement. The questions involved in these two issues go to the very root of the case with regard to *locus standi* of the first party to represent the workmen of the four mines of the management involved in this case and as to whether the dispute on hand is an Industrial Dispute under Section 2(k) of the ID Act, commanding the support of the majority of the workmen of the 4 mines of Byrapur Division involved in this case. These are the two issues involving question of fact and law and the burden to prove them is squarely rest upon the first party, which raised the dispute. No

evidence as such was forth coming on the part of the first party to establish the above said two issues, as noted above. The first party after having filed the Claim Statement has remained in indifferent in attending the case on many number of dates of hearing. Therefore what appears from the conduct of the first party is that it has lost interest in the dispute and is no more willing to go ahead with the proceedings on hand.

24. In the result the court has no hesitation to arrive at the conclusion that the aforesaid two issues remained to be substantiated by the first party and therefore, they are to be answered accordingly in the negative holding the first party has no *locus standi* to represent the workmen of four mines of the management of Byrapur Division and that the dispute raised by the first party is not an Industrial Dispute under Section 2(k) of the ID Act.

25. In the result, the reference is liable to be rejected and hence the following Award :

ORDER

Reference is rejected. No cost.

(Dictated to P. A. transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 16th June, 2004).

A. R. SIDDIQUI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1743.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ऑयल इण्डिया लि., के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में श्रम न्यायालय गुवाहाटी के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/11/2003-आई. आर. (एम)]

बी.एस. डविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2004

S.O. 1743.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Labour Court, Guwahati as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Oil India Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 25-6-2004.

[No. L-30012/11/2003-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GUWAHATI : ASSAM

REFERENCE NO. 6 (C) OF 2004

Present :

Shri T. C. Jain, LL. B.,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Guwahati.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute between :

The Management of
Oil India Ltd., Guwahati-5.

Versus

The workman Ms. Manima Dutta.

Date of Award : 5-5-2004.

AWARD

The reference arising out of the Govt. order No. L-30012/11/2003-IR(M) dt. 4-9-2003 relates to the dispute indicated in the schedule below :

“Whether the action of the management of Brahmaputra Vally Exploration Project, Oil India Ltd. Rangpur, R. G. Baruah Road, Guwahati (Represented through the Dy. General Manager) in not expressly considering the job performed by Miss Manima Dutta as the job directly done under the estt. of BVEP, Oil India, since 1-8-1994 in whatsoever form may be and whether the action of the management of BVEP, Oil India Ltd. in not regularising the service of Miss Manima Dutta under Oil India Ltd. is justified ?

If not, what relief Miss Manima Dutta is entitled to ?”

On receipt of their respective notices both the parties appeared on 18-3-04 before this Tribunal and submitted their joint compromise Petition alongwith Memorandum of settlement which is marked as Annexure ‘X’ stating therein that they have amicably settled their dispute out of Court. The settlement is therefore accepted and an award is hereby passed in terms of the settlement which is a part of the award. The reference case is accordingly finally disposed off.

Given under my hand and seal of this Tribunal on this 5th May, 2004.

T. C. JAIN, Presiding Officer

Annexure-X
Ref. No. 6(c)/04

Memorandum of Settlement Between

The Management of Oil India Limited

AND

Ms. Manima Dutta

Consequent to the appeal by Ms. Manima Dutta to the Management of OIL vide her letter dated 25-11-2003 alongwith a copy of her letter dated 24-09-2003 addressed to the Secy. Govt. of India, Minister of Labour, praying for withdrawal of Report bearing No. 8(31)/2002-G/A of 19-02-2003, after protracted deliberations, this Memorandum of Settlement has been signed by and between the Management of Oil India Ltd. and Ms. Manima Dutta under the following terms of settlement :

Terms of settlement :

1.0 In view of abandonment of the Project (BVEP) although the Management has no legal obligation, but purely on humanitarian ground, has agreed to pay an *ex-gratia* amount to be calculated @ 3(three) months' last drawn service charges for each completed year of service to the aforesaid person. The period of service and the *ex-gratia* amount payable are shown below :

Name	From	To	
Ms. Manima Dutta	1-2-95	30-9-2002	7 yrs. 4550×3×7 =Rs 95,550.00

2.0 Ms. Manima Dutta and the Management shall jointly approach the Industrial Tribunal, Assam, Guwahati for disposal of the Reference made by the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour vide its OM No. L-30012/11/2003-IR(M) dated 4-9-2003 as "No Dispute" or "Dispute has been amicably settled by and between the parties".

3.0 The amount calculated as in clause 1.0 above will be paid to Ms. Manima Dutta by A/c. payee cheque within a period of 30 days from the date of disposal of the Reference case by the Industrial Tribunal, Assam, Guwahati.

4.0 Ms. Dutta however has made an appeal to the Management that as and when there be any requirement in any Project/Place of Oil India Ltd, her case may be sympathetically considered with better terms than those received by her in BVEP.

Signed this on the 10th day of February, 2004.

Representing the Person Concerned	Representing the Management of Oil India Ltd.
Sd/- (Manima Dutta)	Sd/- (Amiya Sarma)
	Sd/- (M.M. Mazumdar)
Witness :	Witness :
	Sd/- (Illegible)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1744.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, एस.ई.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/जबलपुर (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी./एल.सी./ (आर.) (94)/99 को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/154/98-आई. आर (सी-II)]
एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1744.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC(R)(94)/99 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of SECL and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 28-6-2004.

[No. L-22012/154/98-IR(C-II)]
N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-
CUM-LABOUR COURT
JABALPUR (MP)**

CASE No. : CGIT/LC(R) (94)/99

PRESIDING OFFICER: SHRIKANT SHUKLA

Shri S. N. Shrivastava
Through : President, RKKMS (INTUC),
B-21, Indira Vihar, Seepat Road,
Bilaspur.
AND
SECL Raigarh Area,
13-5-2004

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. L-22012/154/98/IR(C-II) dtd. 22-2-1999 referred the following issue for adjudication to P. O. CGIT-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Whether the action of the General Manager, SECL, Raigarh Area of SECL in denying Shri S. N. Shrivastava regularization to the post of T & S Gr. 'A' and not paying him wages of the said post is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

In spite of the fact that copy of order dtd. 22-2-1999 was endorsed to the Union, the Union did not file SOC within the stipulated period. Under the circumstance, notices were issued to the Union but Statement of Claim was not filed. It is note worthy that notice was sufficiently served on the union.

The union has not come forward with the specific date as to when he was to be regularized. On the other hand, the management has filed Memorandum of Settlement, Paper No. 14. wherein it was agreed between the concerned workman Shri S. N. Shrivastava and the management that Shri S. N. Shrivastava shall be given T & S Gr. 'A' on completion of the Cadre Scheme under NCWA-V w.e.f. 1-9-1999, without any monetary benefit except notional fixation.

It appears that the union remained satisfied and they have not come forward with the claim. Under the circumstance, it will be deemed fit to pass "No Claim Award".

No Claim Award is accordingly passed and Paper No. 14 the Memorandum of Settlement will the part of the Award.

SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer
Form H

(RULE-58 UNDER I.D. ACT RULES)

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT

- Rep. Employer : (A) Sri G. Prasad, Dy. C.P.M.,
Raigarh Area
(B) L. N. Durga Prasad, Dy.
P.M. Raigarh Area.
- Rep. Workman : (A) Sri S.N. Srivastava.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

Sri S.N. Srivastava, Foreman (Elect.) T & S Gr. 'B' of Chhal and the SECL Management Representative agreed

to accept the following terms and condition which are laid down below :—

1. That, the issue has been negotiated amicably between the workman and the management for resolving in accordance with the Cadre Scheme under NCWA-V.
2. That, in the event of agreeing to give him regularisation by the management, on completion of the required experience under the Cadre Scheme, the Applicant is not interested to continue the proceedings before the Hon'ble Authority.
3. Both the parties, in the event of above understanding, submit that the present proceedings, pending before the Hon'ble Authority, may please be closed and rectified award may kindly be issued.
4. Sri S.N. Shrivastava, shall be given T & S Gr. 'A' on completion of Cadre Scheme under NCWA-V e.g. w.e.f. Sept. 1999 without any monetary except Notional Fixation.
5. The both parties have agreed and accepted the settlement and a copy be sent to CGIT for issuing Award in this respect.

Sd/-

Sri S.N. Shrivastava,
Concerned workman

Sd/-

Sri Gopal Prasad,
Dy. Chief Personnel Manager

Sd/-

Sri G.L.N. Durga Prasad,
Dy. Personnel Manager.

S. N. Shrivastava,
Foreman (Elect.)
Chhal Incline
S.E.C.L. Raigarh Area

Witness : Sd/-
(Illegible)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का.आ. 1745.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसार में, एस.ई.सी.एल. प्रबंधन के संबंध निषेधकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण जबलपुर (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी./एल.सी./आर/53/92) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/361/91-आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1745.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT/LC/R/53/92) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of SECL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 28-6-2004.

[No. L-22012/361/91-IR (C-II)]
N.P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

PRESENT :—Shrikant Shukla, Presiding Officer

Case No. CGIT/LC (R) (53) of 1992

Between General Manager, South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Kusmunda Project Distt.—Bilaspur. (Presently Chhattisgarh)

AND

Vice President, M.P. Koyla Shramik Sangh (CITU), Quarter No. M/192, Pump House, P.O. Korba Colliery, Distt. Bilaspur. (Presently Chhattisgarh)

AWARD

Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour vide its order No. 22012/361/91/IR (C-II) 12-3-92 referred the following issue for adjudication to P. O. Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jabalpur.

"Whether the management of Kusmunda Project of SECL, Bilaspur justified in not promoting S/Shri R.K. Kesharwani, R.K. Patel, V.K. Soni, V.N. Vishwakarma and R.A. Rathore as Fitter Gr. III w.e.f. 9-3-88 when their juniors S/Sri K. Patra and others have been promoted? If not, to what relief the worker concerned are entitled to?"

During the course of proceedings the parties have come to the settlement, and the Memorandum of Settlement has been filed which is paper number-11.

The terms of settlement are as follows—

1. That Shri R.K. Kesharwani, R.K. Patel, V.K. Soni, V.N. Vishwakarma and Ramadhar Rathore, E.P. Fitter Gr. II, Kusmunda Project will be allowed notional seniority w.e.f. 2-4-92 with notional fixation without any monetary benefit to the post of EP Fitter Gr. II.
2. That the union/workmen shall withdraw the case No. CGIT/LC/R 53/92 pending before the Hon'ble CGIT Jabalpur and petition to this effect shall be submitted before the CGIT by the Management and Union.
3. That this settles fully and finally all the claims pertaining to their promotion/regularization and the workmen shall not raise any dispute regarding their past promotion in future either himself/themselves or through any union.

I have verified the memorandum of statement by examining Shri T.K. Bose, Dy. C.P.M. Kusmunda on behalf of management and worker namely, Shri R.K. Kesharwani, Vice President of Union, Shri Kameshwar Singh on behalf of union, who have signed the Memorandum of Settlement. During examination Dy. CPM has stated on oath that the concerned union have arrived at a settlement on 26-8-95. He has verified the memorandum of settlement paper No. 11. He has also stated that the concerned worker will be given for notional seniority w.e.f. 2-4-92 on EP Fitter Gr. II and their salary will be fixed accordingly. So far as the monetary benefit are concerned, the worker shall get the monetary benefit from the date of settlement i.e. 26-8-95. However, the monetary benefit will not be paid prior to 26-8-95. Shri R. K. Kesharwani has also verified the

memorandum of settlement and has stated that he was promoted on EP Gr. II on 1-5-94. However, now he will get seniority from 2-4-92 and his salary shall be accordingly fixed. However he shall get monetary benefit from 26-8-95. The Vice President Shri Kameshwar Singh has also verified the settlement.

All the persons have examined and this memorandum of settlement is finally disposed of the reference finally.

Although, the issue referred for adjudication was in respect of promotion to the concerned worker to Fitter Gr. III w.e.f. 9-3-88. It appears that the dispute has been resolved between the parties by fixing seniority in the Fitter Gr. II as the workers in the meantime were promoted to Fitter Gr. II. The issue referred is disposed of in view of the above settlement arrived between the parties. Award is passed accordingly. Settlement paper No. 11 shall be the part of award.

SHRI KANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer
REF. NO. SECL/GM/KSM/DY CPM. . . 6151
Dt. 19-9-95

Form 'H'
(See Rule 58)

Form of Memorandum of Settlement.

Name of : Representing : T. K. Bose,
Parties Employer : Dy. Chief Personnel
Manager, SECL, Kusmunda
Area.
Representing : Sri. Kameshwar Singh,
Workmen Vice President, MPKSS
(CITU) (CS) S/Shri.
1. R. K. Kesarvani EP Fitter
Gr. I
2. V. K. Soni -do-
3. VN Visva- -do-
karma
4. Ramadhar -do-
Rathore

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE :

S/Shri. R.K. Kesarvani, R.K. Patel, V.K. Soni, V.N. Visvakarma and Ramdhar Rathore were appointed initially as Category I Mazdoors in August/Nov. 83, subsequently promoted to the post of Gen. Mazdoor/Helper Cat. II from 3-8-84, thereafter to EPGH in Excavation Gr. 'E'. They were further promoted to the post of EP Fitter Gr. III with effect from 19-4-89. Thereafter the Union raised a dispute for effecting their promotion w.e.f. 9-3-88, the date from which Shri. A.K. Patra and others have been promoted to the post of EP Fitter Gr. III, on the plea that Shri. A.K. Patra and others were juniors to them since they were appointed after R.K. Kesarvani and others. The case is pending before the CGIT vide case No. CGIT/LC/R/53/92.

The Management contented that Shri. K.S. Patra and others were appointed directly as Category II after a

special interview conducted by the management from Danc 'arny Project, Orissa. This was resorted to as there was need of some experienced persons. They were given direct Category II post on their experience put in by them in the Govt. Organisation. They are ITI certificate holders and in consideration of their special skill and experience they were promoted to the post of EP Fitter Gr. III in Excav. Gr. D and granted notional seniority w.e.f. 9-3-88. They were governed by separate seniority list and as such claim of Shri. R.K. Kesarvani and others have not relevancy with them. Shri. K.S. Patra and others have already been promoted to Gr. II w.e.f. 2-4-92 whereas Shri. R.K. Kesarvani and others have been promoted to Gr. II w.e.f. 1-5-94 and V.N. Viswakarma w.e.f. 11-7-93.

However, Union wanted the matter to be discussed for settlement outside court and accordingly discussion was held on 10-5-95 at SECL HD. Qrs, with the Union and the Management. During the course of discussion Union agreed to withdraw the case from the CGIT if notional seniority is granted to all the incumbants. In view of the above, the competent authority as a gesture of goodwill, has agreed for granting S/Shri. R.K. Kesarvani and others notional seniority as communicated vide letter No. SECL/BSP/PER/IR/95/918 dated, 19/20-6-95 on the following terms and conditions.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS :

1. That Shri. R.K. Kesarvani, R.K. Patel, V.K. Soni, V.N. Visvakarma and Ramadhar Rathore, EP Fitter Gr. II, Kusmunda Project will be allowed notional seniority w.e.f. 2-4-92 with notional fixation without any monetary benefit to the post of EP Fitter Gr. II
2. That the Union/workmen shall withdraw the case No. CGIT/LC/R/53/92 pending before the Hon'ble CGIT Jabalpur and petition to this effect shall be submitted before the CGIT by the Management and Union.
3. That this settles fully and finally all the claims pertaining to their promotion/regularisation and the workmen shall not raise any dispute regarding their past promotion in future either himself/themselves or through any union.

Signature of : (Kameshwar Singh)
the Parties Vice President
MPKSS/CITU(C)

(T.K. Bose)
Dy. CPM, SECL,
Kusmunda Area.

Witness :

- 1.
- 2.

(R. K. KESWARVANI)
(V. K. SONI)
(V. N. VISWAKARMA)
(RAMADHAR RATHORE)

Witnesses :

1. S. S. Saigal
2. P. Pappachan

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1746.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, खादी और ग्रामीण उद्योग आयोग प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जयपुर (संदर्भ संख्या सी.जी.आई.टी. 4/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 42012/204/2002-आई. आर (सी.-II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1746.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. CGIT-4/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of Khadi & Village Industries Commission, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 28-6-2004.

[No. L-42012/204/2002-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
JAIPUR

Case No. CGIT-4/2003.

Reference No. L-42012/204/2002-IR(C-II)

Shri Prahlad Sahai Meena,
S/o Shri Surajmal Meena,
R/o Village & Post - Aatela,
Tehsil - Viratnagar
Distt. Jaipur (Rajasthan).

... Applicant

Versus

1. Director (Administration),
Khadi & Village Industries Commission,
3, Irla Road, Parkvarli,
Mumbai-400056.
2. National Project Convenor,
Kumarappa National Handmade Paper Instt.,
UNDP-KVIC Project, Ramsingh Pura,
Sanganer,
Jaipur (Rajasthan).

... Non-applicants

Present :

Presiding Officer : Shri R. C. Sharma.
For the applicant : Shri S. P. Singh.
For the non-applicant : Shri R. K. Sharma.
Date of award : 3-6-2004

AWARD

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Clause 'D' of Sub-sections 1 and 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (herein

after referred to as the Act) has referred the following industrial disputes for adjudication to this Tribunal which runs as under :—

"Whether the action of the management of Khadi & Village Industries Commission in terminating the services of Shri Prahlad Sahai Meena S/o Surajmal Meena w.e.f 30-7-1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief he is entitled to?"

2. The workman in his statement of claim has pleaded that he was appointed as a 4th Class Employee on 17-9-1992 by the non-applicant management against the permanent post which was lying vacant and that on 20-7-94 he had complained to non-applicant No. 1 against the non-applicant No. 2 to this effect that he was forced to perform the domestic work at the residence of non-applicant No. 2. When this fact came into the notice of the non-applicant No. 2, his service was terminated on 30-7-94 by an oral order. He preferred a writ petition against this order before the Hon'ble Rajasthan High Court, which was disposed of vide order dated 29-8-2001 with a direction that the workman may raise an industrial dispute. Thereupon, he unsuccessfully raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) at Jaipur, who later on submitted the failure report to the Central Government, which has referred the dispute to this Court. While assailing the termination order, the workman has further averred that neither the notice was served upon him, nor the wages in lieu of notice and compensation were paid to him. It has also been stated that at the time of his termination, the junior employees to him were retained and after his termination, the new hands, viz., Shri Ram Prasad Sharma and Shri Narendra Kumar Sharma were appointed by the management without affording him an opportunity of employment. On these grounds, the workman has claimed that his termination order may be quashed and he may be reinstated in the service with back wages and all other consequential benefits.

3. Both the non-applicants have disputed the claim of the workman by way of filing their respective written statement and have adopted a common stand. They have pleaded, *inter alia*, that the post of the National Project, Convenor has been abolished, that the non-applicant management does not fall within the ambit of the definition of industry as defined under Section 2-J of the Act and that the workman has not completed 240 days of service with the non-applicant management. They have further denied that the junior employees to the workman were retained at the time of his said termination and that no fresh appointments were made by the management.

4. The workman has filed the rejoinder wherein he has reiterated the facts as stated by him in the statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings of both the parties, the following points for determination were framed :—

I. Whether the workman was appointed as 4th Class employee on 17-9-92 by the non-applicants, whose service was illegally terminated on 30-7-94 without payment of salary in lieu of one month's notice and compensation thereof? BOA

II. Whether the new employees, who have been named at para 8 of the statement of claim, have been employed after the termination of the service of workman? BOA

III. Whether the non-applicant no. 2 is not a necessary party in the dispute? BONA

IV. Whether the non-applicant management does not fall within the definition of 'industry' under Section 2-J of the ID Act? BONA

V. Whether the workman is entitled to reinstatement in service?

6. In the oral evidence, the workman Sh. Prahlad Sahai Meena has filed his own affidavit, who was cross-examined on behalf of the non-applicants. On behalf of the non-applicants, the counter-affidavits of Sh. Bharat Lal Meena, Assistant Director and Sh. Baleshwar Prasad, Technical Officer were placed on the record, who were cross-examined on behalf of the workman.

7. The workman in support of his case, has placed three documents on the record, whereas the non-applicants have chosen not file any document.

8. I have heard both the parties and have gone through the record. The point-wise discussion follows as under:—

Point No. I

9. The Ld. representative for the workman contends that the workman was appointed on 17-9-92 by the non-applicant management who continuously worked up to 30-7-94. His submission is that the workman had continuously worked for a period of 240 days, but he was terminated without following the requirements laid down under Section 25-F of the Act. The Ld. representative, in support of his contention, has relied upon Ex. W-1 and Ex. W-2.

10. Countering the submissions made on behalf of the workman, the Ld. representative for the non-applicants contends that the workman had not completed 240 days of employment with the non-applicant management and that neither he was appointed nor his service was terminated.

11. I have bestowed my thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions.

12. So far as the employment of the workman by non-applicant management is concerned, on behalf of the non-applicants it has been denied. But to substantiate the claim, the workman has placed Ex. W-1, the letter written by the National Project Convener (non-applicant no. 1) to the Director, Khadi & Village Industry Commission (Non-applicant no. 2) and the copies of the note-sheets, Ex. W-2.

13. In the letter Ex. W-1, the non-applicant no. 2 has stated that the regular staff could not be appointed against the sanctioned post in the project due to some administrative difficulties and at present the daily wagers are working on the grades mentioned against their names in order to carry on the smooth running of the project. Four daily wagers have been named in this letter and at serial no. 3 occurs the name of the workman, who is shown to be engaged on the payment of the wages @ Rs. 30/- per day. This fact is further fortified by the note-sheet dated 18-9-92 which says that an application for the post of peon was received on 17-9-92 and after noting the particulars of the workman and his educational qualification, the permission was sought for his appointment. It is further revealed that the permission for his appointment was accorded on 18-9-92. So far as the genuineness of both these documents are concerned, MW-1, Shri Bharat Lal Meena in his cross-examination has admitted that the letter Ex. W-1 was received in their office, which was transmitted by the non-applicant no. 2. Similarly, MW-2, Shri Baleshwar Prasad in his cross-examination has also admitted that the note-sheet Ex. W-2 belong to their department. Thus, this fact stands fully proved that the workman was appointed by the non-applicant management on 18-9-92 as a 4th Class employee.

14. Now, I am called upon to decide as to whether the workman has completed more than 240 days of employment in the calendar year preceding to this termination.

15. The workman in his statement of claim and affidavit has categorically pointed out that he has worked for more than 240 days. This fact has further been admitted by MW-2, Shri Baleshwar Prasad in his cross-examination, who has deposed that the workman had worked from 17-9-92 to 30-7-94 in the office of the non-applicant no. 2. Thus it is established that the workman has worked for more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding to his termination. The management witness Shri Baleshwar Prasad has also admitted this fact that the workman was performing the duties of the chowkidar in the office.

16. It could not be denied on behalf of the management that no notice or wages in lieu of notice and compensation were paid to the workman as required under Section 25-F of the Act. As such, the management has violated the provision contained under Section 25-F of the Act and the said termination of the workman amounts to the retrenchment. Accordingly, this point is decided in favour of the workman and against the non-applicants.

Point No. II

17. During the course of the argument, the Ld. representative for the workman has contended that the workman has pleaded at para 8 of the statement of claim that at the time of his termination, the junior employees to him were retained and he has also averred that after his termination, new hands were recruited. Since the plea of violation of the provision under Section 25-F of the Act has also been adopted by the workman in his statement of claim,

which has been denied on behalf of the non-applicants, it would be expedient to discuss the same under Issue No. II.

18. In the statement of claim, the workman could not be able to name those junior employees who were retained in the service by the management at the time of his termination. This fact could not also be disclosed in the affidavit of the workman. However, in his cross-examination he has pointed out that the junior employees to him, viz., Sh. Ram Prasad, Sh. Mohan Singh and Sh. Babu Lal are still working with the management. But in the statement of claim, he has named Sh. Ram Prasad Sharma as a fresh hand who was appointed after his termination. Therefore, firstly, the version of the workman on this point is self-contradictory and secondly, no corroborating evidence could be brought on the record to support his submission that the juniors to him were retained in the employment by the management at the time of his termination. Hence, this submission made on behalf of the workman is negated.

19. Now, I advert to the question as to whether the fresh hands were appointed by the non-applicant management after the termination of the workman without affording him an opportunity of employment.

20. The workman has pointed out in his statement of claim that Sh. Ram Prasad Sharma and Sh. Narendra Kumar Sharma were appointed after his termination. MW-2, Sh. Baleshwar Prasad in reply to a question put by the Ld. representative for the workman has admitted that after 30-7-94, the new appointments have been made, but he is unable to point out the number of such appointments.

21. In this manner, the submission made on behalf of the workman stands corroborated from the deposition of the management witnesses and the evidence on the record lead to infer that after the termination of the workman, new appointments have been made by the non-applicant management in violation of Section 25-H of the Act. This contention put forth on behalf of the workman is, therefore, accepted and this point is decided in favour of the workman.

Point No. III

22. It has been pleaded at para 1 of the counter-statement filed on behalf of the non-applicant no. 1 that the post of the National Project Convener has been abolished and he has become an unnecessary party to the dispute. MW-2, Sh. Baleshwar Prasad in his affidavit at para 2 has stated that the post of the National Project Convener has been abolished. But he has admitted that this post existed in the year 1992 and the post bearer had made the appointments on daily wages and after the year 1997, the non-applicant management has been converted as an autonomous body. Thus, the submission made on behalf of the non-applicants is untenable and it cannot be accepted that the office relating to non-applicant No. 2. has lost its existence. Therefore, this point is decided against the non-applicants and in favour of the workman.

Point No. IV

23. It has also been contended on behalf of the non-applicants that the non-applicant management no. 2 is not an industry. The expression 'industry' has been defined under Section 2-J of the Act, which says that "industry" means any systematic activity on by co-operation between an employer and his workmen (whether such workmen are employed by such employer directly or by or through any agency, including a contractor) for the production, supply or distribution of goods or services with a view to satisfy human wants or wishes (not being wants or wishes which are merely spiritual or religious in nature)".

24. MW-2, Sh. Baleshwar Prasad has admitted in his cross-examination that the non-applicant management no. 2 manufactures the blank sheets, which indicates that the manufacturing work is being conducted by the non-applicant management and this point too is decided against the non-applicants accordingly.

Relief

25. For the foregoing reasons, the workman has succeeded in establishing his claim, which deserves to be allowed having considered that fact of workman's earning from his agricultural land ranging from Rs.10000/- to Rs. 15000/- per annum, it would be expedient to grant him 25 per cent of the back wages.

26. According, an award is passed in these terms that the impugned termination order dated 30-7-1994 is illegal and unjustified and the workman is entitled to be reinstated in the service with its continuity and with 25 per cent of the back wages.

R. C. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1747.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, एन. सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, गोवाहाटी [संदर्भ संख्या 5 (सी)/2004] को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/306/2002-आई. आर (सी.-II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1747.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award [Ref. No. 5(c) of 2004] of the Industrial Tribunal, Guwahati in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the management of North Eastern Coalfields Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 28-6-2004.

[No. L-22012/306/2002-IR (C.-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL:
GUWAHATI: ASSAM
REFERENCE NO. 5(C) OF 2004**

Present : Shri T.C. Jain, LL.B.,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Guwahati.
In the matter of an Industrial Dispute Between:
The Management of
North Eastern Coalfields,
Coal India Ltd.

Versus

Their workman Shri Amar Mura.

Date of Award: 15-5-2004.

AWARD

This reference arising out of the Govt. Order No. L-22012/306/2002 IR (CM-II) dt. 16-10-03 relates to the dispute indicated in the schedule as follows:

"Whether the action of the management of Ledo Colliery in terminating the services of Shri Amar Mura is legal and justified?

If not, to what relief Sri Mura is entitled to?"

Pursuance with notice the management side filed an application dt. 5-3-04 & 21-4-04 contenting therein that the workman Amar Mura expired on 17-5-03 and accordingly management has paid his all Gratuity and Provident fund amounts and no dues were found to be pending from the management side. On the otherhand Shri Swapan Roy, General Secretary, Rashtriya Coal Mazdoor Union (CITU) has also submitted a petition that the workman Amar Mura for whom the instant Industrial Dispute raised was unfortunately died on account of prolonged illness at his residence on 17-5-03 (Death Certificate is enclosed) and as such the Secretary request to withdrawn the reference from this Tribunal.

In view of the above and in the circumstances the prayer for withdrawing the case is allowed and the reference is accordingly finally disposed of as a no dispute award.

Given under my hand and seal of this Tribunal on this 15-5-2004.

T.C. JAIN, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1748.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, एस. सी.सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद (संदर्भ संख्या 46/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/237/88-डी. IV.बी.]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1748.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 46/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of SCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 28-6-04.

[No. L-22012/237/88-D.IV.B.]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT
HYDERABAD**

**Present:-Shri E. Ismail, B.Sc., LL.B.,
Presiding Officer**

Dated the 14th day of June, 2004

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 46/2004

**(Old I.D. No. 49/89 transferred from Industrial
Tribunal-1, Hyderabad)**

Between:

Sri Y. Pochaiah,
C/o Rajaiah Hotel,
Near Super Bazar,
P.O. Godavarikhani
District Karimnagar.

... Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,
M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Area-I, Ramagundam Division,
P.O. Godavarikhani,
District Karimnagar.

... Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner :

M/s A.K. Jayaprakash
Rao, M. Govind & K. Ajay
Kumar, Advocates

For the Respondent :

M/s K. Srinivasa Murthy
& G. Sudha, Advocates

AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-22012 (237)/88-D.IV.B. dated 4-7-89 referred the following dispute under section 10(I)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal-I, Hyderabad between the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co.Ltd., and their workman which has been transferred to this Tribunal in view of Government of India, Ministry of Labour's Order No.H-11026/1/2001-IR (C.II) dated 18-10-2001 bearing No. I. D. 49/1989. The reference is,

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Area I, Ramagundam Division, P. O. Godavarikhani, District Karimnagar (AP) in dismissing Sri Y. Pochaiah, General Mazdoor, Auto Workshop w.e.f. 17-11-86 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

The reference is renumbered in this Tribunal as I.D. No. 46/2004.

2. On the above reference the Industrial Tribunal-I, Hyderabad (Of the State Government) has passed an award in I.D. 49/1989 on 19-4-1994 directing the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner with full back wages, continuity of service and all attendant benefits. Before passing the award the Industrial Tribunal-I vide an order dated 11-6-1993 held that the domestic enquiry conducted under the said case is improper and vitiated. Accordingly, the Management examined as many as four witnesses and the Petitioner examined himself and after recording the evidence the award was passed as mentioned above. The Management challenged the said award by way of a writ and the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. was pleased to pass order in WP No. 19849/1995 on 20-11-2003 holding that the Tribunal namely the State Government Industrial Tribunal has not discussed the entire evidence and had not passed the reasoned award. Accordingly, it remanded the matter to this Tribunal on the ground that the matters are now being entrusted to Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court.

3. Immediately on receipt of the order the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. a letter was addressed for records and the same were received in this Court through Industrial Tribunal-I, on 22-3-2004 and this Court asked for extension of time vide letter dated 26-4-2004 to extend the time for disposal upto 30-6-2004. The brief facts which lead to the reference as stated in the claim petition are; That the Petitioner was appointed as a general mazdoor in the respondent Company in the year 1975. Has put in an unblemished record of service till he was illegally dismissed from service by an order dated 17-11-85. The Petitioner submits the order of dismissal passed by the Respondent is illegal, unjust, contrary in law and in violation of principles of natural justice. Much is written against enquiry which need not be repeated here. The only ground is that while he was working under the control of Respondent he applied for two days casual leave on 14th and 15th July, 1985 and thereafter the Petitioner fell sick and medical officer of the Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam examined the Petitioner and declared him unfit to discharge duties from 17th to 23rd July, 1985. As there was no improvement he took treatment from Dr. R.R. Parya at Warangal from 24-7-85 to 6-12-85. The Petitioner submits that he has also sent intimations to Respondent with regard to sickness of the Petitioner and also sent a telegram informing the Respondent about his sickness. The Respondent having received the telegram from the

Petitioner did not sent a communication with regard to the sanction of leave or otherwise. After the so-called enquiry he was dismissed. He made several representations, submitted mercy petition and all efforts of the Petitioner are in vain. As he was left with no option, he has no alternative but to withdraw the GPF and Gratuity amounts for the survival of his family members. The Petitioner further submits that the Management informed him by a letter dated 8-8-98 that in the committee constituted for reviewing cases, rejected the claim of the Petitioner. That the order of punishment is an act of victimization and unfair labour practice and the Management has failed to take his past conduct into consideration. Hence, he may be reinstated with back wages, continuity of service and all other attendant benefits.

3. A counter was filed stating that he was irregular in duties. In spite of repeated warnings he was earlier suspended from duty at once for misconduct of his unauthorized absenteeism. That is why, he was given a charge sheet for being absent from 16-7-85 to 5-8-85 and that he was ultimately dismissed from 17-11-85. It is true that he was sanctioned leave on 14th and 15th July 1985 but thereafter he absented himself without further leave. No information was received that he was sick. That the Management has no information that he was under treatment with Dr. R.R. Parya, Warangal from 24-7-1985. No telegram was received. The Respondent Company is having full-fledged hospital. The Petitioner as to cover up his unauthorized absence has chosen to bring medical certificate as an after thought and the Petitioner is put to strict proof of the said medical certificates. An enquiry was conducted properly. That the Petitioner has personally received the dismissal letter on 8-12-85. After receiving the dismissal letter also he did not file any mercy petition immediately on the contrary claimed GPF, Gratuity, Family Benefit Insurance Scheme, etc., which were already paid to him. That a review was held in all the cases of dismissal, i.e., either for reinstatement with back wages along with all other benefits. In view of the above mentioned facts this court may be to dismiss the petition.

4. As already held the case was decided and the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. has remanded to consider the evidence let in before this Court.

5. As the departmental enquiry was vitiated the Management has examined 4 witnesses. MW1 Sri M. Ram Mohan Rao, Personal Officer in Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.. He deposed that he was appointed as to conduct the domestic enquiries against the delinquent employees who commit misconducts. The said order is Ex. M1. Ex. M2 is the office copy of the charge sheet. Ex. M3 is the registered cover returned etc. That he conducted the domestic enquiry. That he prepared enquiry report dated 28-8-1985 and submitted the same to the Management which is Ex. M9. In the cross examination he denied that the Petitioner was not given proper opportunity in enquiry.

6. Sri C. Chandra Sekharao, Divisional Engineer, Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., deposed as MW2. He deposed that he worked as Senior Executive Engineer in Auto Workshop, Godavarikhani from 1984 to 1988. Ex.M10 is the dismissal order of the Petitioner. In the cross examination he deposed that after the dismissal order was received unserved he did not try to serve on the Petitioner.

7. MW3, Sri M. Murali Mohanachari, clerk deposed that no telegram was received as contended by the Petitioner. In the cross examination he agreed that it is true that when the Petitioner returned for duty on 8-12-1985 along with Ex. W2, they served the dismissal order.

8. By oversight MW2 was again examined as MW4 who deposed that the Petitioner was very irregular. Action was already taken against him previously. The Petitioner was suspended twice with regard to the absenteeism. He denied that the Petitioner was sick and therefore he was dismissed.

9. The Petitioner examined himself as WW1 and deposed that on 14th and 15th July, 1985 he applied for leave and went away. He became sick from 15th July, 1985 in the hospital of the Respondent Company at Godavarikhani. Though he had not recovered from his illness it was certified on 23-7-1985 in Ex.W1 that he was fit for duty from 23-7-1985. But he is not recovered from sickness. So he went to Warangal and took treatment from Dr. R.R.Parya from 24-7-1985 to 6-12-1985. Ex W2 is the Form A and fitness certificate issued by the said Doctor. He sent a telegram to the Management on 7-9-1985. In the cross examination he deposed that he applied for leave on 14th and 15th July and went to Karimnagar and returned to Godavarikhani on 16-7-1985. That he did not maintain the office copy of the telegram issued by him under Ex. W3. Ex W3 does not disclose any 'to' address or 'from' address. He will examine the Doctors who gave him. Ex. W1 and W2.

10. It is argued by the Learned Counsel of the Petitioner that as per 1955 (1), ALD page 478 wherein it was held that "service regulations prescribing 'absence without cause' as a misconduct—employee establishing acceptable cause for his absence—it does not constitute misconduct—though he had no leave to his credit, extraordinary leave without pay has to be granted". He also relied on 1999 (1) CLJ page 1014 wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that, "unauthorized absence for a week, held dismissal is a too harsh punishment." He also relied on Hon'ble Supreme Court of India 2000 (1) LLJ wherein the Supreme Court held that, "when the powers of the Labour Court under Sec.11A of the I.D. Act are wide enough to convert an order of dismissal into one of lesser punishment. It is also well settled that it should be open to the High Court in justifiable cases to modify the Order of the Labour Court. He submits that here the Petitioner has been able to establish that he was under treatment of the Company hospital itself from 17-7-1985 to 23-7-1985 and vide Ex. W1 and vide Ex. W2 he was under treatment of Dr. R.R. Parya, Warangal from

24-7-1985 to 6-12-1985. Both Form-A and fitness certificate have been given by Civil Surgeon, Respondent's Medical Officer of a Government Hospital and how it can be deployed. Further, Ex. W3 is the telegram sent to the Respondent. Hence, he submits that the order of the Industrial Tribunal-I, first passed may be again passed by this Hon'ble Court directing the reinstatement with back wages and continuity of service.

11. It is argued by the Learned Counsel for the Respondent that the Petitioner has absented himself. He is continuously absent from 16-7-1985 to 5-8-1985 and in fact he has been absent upto 6-12-85 without intimating the company. So all these are fake documents. Hence they cannot be believed and he is not entitled to any relief.

12. It may be seen that however much one may try to hide the truth somehow or other it generally comes up where one looks at the facts seriously. The Petitioner coolly says that he was sick from 17-7-1985 to 23-7-1985. Then as per Ex. W1 in this Collieries Hospital itself. But he does not say that he was inpatient. When he could have travel all the way from Ramagundam to Warangal immediately to start taking treatment in the M.G.M. Hospital, under Civil Surgeon R.M.O., Warangal. I wonder what prevented him from informing the company. He himself could have personally gone and informed or otherwise he could have sent through some of his family members or registered post acknowledgement due. He comes up with a second plea that he sent a telegram on 7-9-85. He is a person who has been so negligent from 24-7-1985 to 7-9-1985 i.e., almost 1½ months he has not bothered about his job. Not that he was an inpatient. He was a out-patient and nothing prevented him from again informing in these 1½ months. Even after 1½ months there is no proof as admitted by him. Ex. W3 does not show from whom the telegram is sent and to whom it is sent. So it can be safely concluded that some telegram coupon issued by some XYZ is pressed into service and has borrowed from someone and attached to this. I do understand that I have to confine myself only to the period from 16-7-1985 to 5-8-1985 for which the enquiry was conducted. But the previous conduct and the subsequent conduct also has to be seen to come to a correct conclusion. He coolly walks in after receiving Ex. W2 in December after a lapse of 5½ months as if the Company was waiting only for him and what are the other documents that are filed by him to substantiate that he has been approaching pleading mercy and what was his previous conduct? Suspended twice for his absenteeism. I do not want to say anything on the certificate issued by the Civil Surgeon Ex. W2. Because it is not befitting on my part to pass any comments in absence of any one. As it is cardinal principle of law that no one shall be condemned without being heard. So I take it for granted that Ex. W2 is correctly given. The Petitioner was under the treatment of the Doctor but, what does Ex. W2 say that he was suffering from

some disease, it does not say that he was unable to move or an inpatient. It does not say that he is not in a position to attend duty or he sent a telegram or a registered post letter was sent or so. There is no other evidence coming before this Court that he was so sick that he was unable to talk, unable to move so, all this shows that even not informing the Management, for which, from 16-7-1985 to 5-8-1985 itself is a sufficient cause taking for granted that he was made fit to join on 23-7-1985 by the Company Doctor it was none of his business to rush to the Warangal Hospital without informing that he is not fit to join. Although the Company Doctor has asked him to resume duties. He has further withdrawn all the amounts due for him. There is no proof that he has tried to contact the Company for his absence from 17-7-1985 to 5-8-1985 and the company has tried its level best to serve summons as per the addresses given by him. Accordingly, they were forced to conduct an *ex-parte* enquiry what else can they do except sending notices to him on the last known address. Therefore, I am satisfied that the company is able to prove that the Petitioner was absent from 16-7-1985 to 5-8-1985 more particularly from 24-8-1985 as the Company Doctor had certified him to be fit as per Ex. W2. He says that he is sick but the conduct of his running away, going from Kothagudem to Warangal, yet not informing his Management shows his indifferent attitude towards his job. Sympathizing with such persons beyond a particular range and giving them back wages and all, I am afraid will not be correct because these are persons who do not take their job seriously. In fact the Petitioner is working, is very clear from the fact that the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. stated that the status quo obtaining as on today shall be maintained. Nobody has brought to the notice of the Court except the Respondent's Counsel while arguing that again the Petitioner is facing an enquiry for absenteeism which is not denied by the counsel for the Petitioner that means he was reinstated. Anyway, according to me the punishment of dismissal is too harsh a punishment and I answer the reference as follows. The award of the Industrial Tribunal-I. was passed on I.D. No. 49/89 on 19-4-1994. Publication etc., would have taken some time. So I hold that the Petitioner is entitled for reinstatement from 1st July, 1994. But he shall not be entitled for any back wages from 17-11-1985 or any other benefits including continuity of service from 17-11-1985 till 30-6-1994. His past services from the date of his joining of the service till 17-11-1985 shall be paid calculated for his terminal benefits. If he is not paid from 1-7-1994 he shall be till he is reinstated from such date i.e., 1-7-1994. The reference is ordered accordingly.

Award passed. Transmit.

Dictated to Kum. K. Phani Gowri. Personal Assistant transcribed by her and corrected and pronounced by me on this the 14th day of June, 2004.

E. ISMAIL, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner:

WW1: Sri Y. Pochaiah

Witnesses examined for the Respondent:

MW1: Sri M. Ram Mohan Rao

MW2: Sri C. Chandra Mohan Rao

MW3: Sri M. Murali Mohanachari

MW4: Sri C. Chandra Mohan Rao

Documents marked for the Petitioner

- Ex. W1: Original of OP ticket of SCCL dispensary, Ramagundam
Ex. W2: Original of Form A & Fitness certificate of WW1
Ex. W3: Postal receipt of issuing telegram

Documents marked for the Respondent

- Ex. M1: Lr. No. Gdk. 5-4-G/85/2564 dt. 18-8-1985
Ex. M2: Copy of charge sheet dt. 5-8-1985
Ex. M3: Registered cover returned
Ex. M4: Original charge sheet dt. 5-8-1985
Ex. M5: Attendance register
Ex. M6: Pay sheet for the month of July, 1985
Ex. M7: Pay sheet for the month of August, 1985
Ex. M8: Enquiry proceedings
Ex. M9: Findings of the Enquiry Officer
Ex. M10: Copy of Lr. No. P.R.G.I./32C/3135 dt. 17-11-1985 dismissal order
Ex. M11: Postal cover returned
Ex. M12: Postal cover returned
Ex. M13: Copy of Lr. No. DE: WS:9A/1007 dt. 28-4-1985
Ex. M14: Copy of Lr. NO. DE/WS/9B/267 dt. 25-11-1984
Ex. M15: Enquiry findings for the year 1984
Ex. M16: Order for Ex. M15 Proceedings
Ex. M17: Connected papers for the past record of unauthorized absence and enquiries conducted
Ex. M18: Attendance register for 1983
Ex. M19: Attendance register for 1984
Ex. M20: Leave Register
Ex. M21: Leave Register
Ex. M22: Leave Register
Ex. M23: Inward Register
Ex. M24: Acknowledgement by the Petitioner
Ex. M25: Information sent by Coal Mines Provident Fund

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1749.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, एस. सी. सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद (संदर्भ संख्या एल. सी.आई.डी. संख्या 230/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 28-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 22013/1/2004-आई. आर. (सी. II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 28th June, 2004

S.O. 1749.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. L.C. I.D. No. 230/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hyderabad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of SCCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 28-6-04.

[No. L-22013/1/2004-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM LABOUR COURT, AT HYDERABAD

Present :—Shir E. Ismail, B.Sc., LL. B.,
Presiding Officer

Dated the 28th day of May, 2004

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE L.C.I.D. No. 230/2002

Between :

Shri P. Sai Kumar,
S/o P. Nagabhushanam,
R/o 8-3-228/1230/2,
Rahamatnagar,
Besides Yousufguda,
Hyderabad.

... Petitioner

AND

1. The Director (CP&P),
The Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Kothagudem. Khammam District.
2. The General Manager,
The Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.,
Ramakrishnapur, Adilabad District. ... Respondents

Appearances :

For the Petitioner : M/s. G. Vidya Sagar, K. Udaya
Sree, P. Sudheer Rao and
D. Madhusudhan. Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. K. Srinivasa Murthy, S.R.
James, V. Umadevi, Vijay
Venkatesh, B. Vijay Kumar, P.
Sridhar, M. Praveen, Suresh, L.
Adibabu, M. S. Rajeshwari,
Prasad & Sanjeev Reddy,
Advocates

AWARD

1. This is a case taken under Sec. 2 A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh reported in W. P. No. 8395 of 1989 dated 3-8-1995 between Sri. U. Chinnappa and M/s. Cotton Corporation of India and two others.

2. The brief averments as averred in the petition are : That the Petitioner's father was working as pump operator in the Respondent Company. He was sent for periodical medical examination to medical board constituted by the Company. After examination medical board declared him unfit for the post, by an order dated 12-1-1991. Basing on the medical report submitted by the Manager RK 4 incline, Ramakrishnapur issued termination order on 25-1-91 on medical grounds. It is submitted that the Petitioner submitted an application on 9-4-91 to the Respondents requesting them to provide employment on compassionate grounds. Since his father has been terminated on medical grounds. The application of the Petitioner was forwarded to the General Manager, Ramakrishnapur. He forwarded the same to General Manager, Kothagudem on 19-6-91 for consideration. The Petitioner was called for interview on 18-1-91. A committee consisting of three members interviewed the Petitioner and the Committee has found the Petitioner fit for the post of clerk-grade-III. The recommendations of the committee were forwarded to General Manager, Kothagudem on 20-9-91. The appointment order was issued to the Petitioner for the post of Clerk Grade III on 13-11-91 Petitioner joined the duties on 2-12-91. While the Petitioner was working as such he was received with charge sheet dated 15-10-93 in which the charge levelled against him was that he has secured employment in connivance with his father by producing a fake certificate of Medical unfitness. That he gave a detailed explanation. Still enquiry was ordered by appointing Sri D.R.R. Murthy as Enquiry Officer. He was removed from service by order dated 20-9-93 w.e.f. 27-9-93. That crime No. 53/93 was registered at Ramakrishnapur Police Station against Dr. Ch. Bhaskar Rao, M.S.A.H., Ramakrishnapuram who was subsequently dismissed from service. Challenging the removal order, the Petitioner filed WP No. 165051/99 before the Hon'ble High Court of A. P., and the same was withdrawn 16-9-2002. That the Petitioner's father was chronic patient and doctors identified as server osteo arthritis of cervical spine and also lumber spine. That Petitioner's father died on 16-5-2002 ailing with same disease. Hence, he may be reinstated.

3. A counter was filed stating that the medically unfit certificate was bogus and fake and signatures of Dr. Y. Rammohan Rao, Addl. Chief Medical Officer, Area Hospital, Ramakrishnapur and Dr. Ch. Bhaskara Rao, Dy. Medical Superintendent, Area Hospital were forged. The dispatch No. 168 pertains to a letter dated 23-1-99 submitted to General Manager requesting advance for LTC home Town in respect of Dr. Ch. Bhaskara Rao, Sri P. Saikumar was issued chargesheet. An enquiry was conducted. The Petitioner was dismissed from 10-7-99. The wages due to him along with the wages towards the balance Earned Leave amounting to Rs. 2427/- was credited to his Bank Account. No doubt, Dr. Bhaskara Rao was dismissed and a crime was registered against him but not for this same reason. That entering the services with false certificate is a gross misconduct. Hence, he is not entitled for any relief.

4. Arguments were advanced on the validity of domestic enquiry and it was held by this Court that the enquiry was validly conducted by a detailed order dated 6-8-2003. Arguments were advanced under Sec. 11A by both the counsels.

5. It is argued by the Learned Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner joined services on 30-11-91 and although misconduct is said to have been discovered on 15-10-93 ultimately, he was dismissed on 10-7-99 i.e., it took six years for dismissal and by then he has put in 8 years service. The long delay itself goes to show that the Management was not inclined to dismiss and ultimately he was dismissed. This Court may show some sympathy and he does deserve the sympathy having been allowed to continue in service for 8 years, hence he may be reinstated.

6. It is argued by the Learned Counsel for the Respondent that it is a grave misconduct to obtain the service by misrepresentation by producing forged and fabricated documents and it is no ground as it is argued by the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner that his father ultimately died on 15-6-2002. Hence, he submits that he does not deserve any sympathy.

7. It may be seen that he joined the service on 13-11-91. Charge sheet was issued on 15-10-93 and he was dismissed on 10-7-99. That means it took six years for the Company to dismiss him allowing him to work for six long years creating false hopes in him. No. doubt, initial appointment was by producing a medically unfit certificate in connivance with his father. That also shows the unemployment problem in India which has reached to maximum with the population and people are ready to resort to anything to gain an employment. Any way, that is for the State Legislature and the Parliament to find out ways and means to improve the employment potential and atleast reduce it to a minimum if not completely eliminated it which is not possible even in the most developed countries. In this case no doubt he does not deserve

reinstatement because in order to obtain employment he has resorted to unfair practice by forging a medical certificate and forging the signatures of two doctors and forging the letter number also along with his father. But however, false hopes have been created in him keeping the matter pending for six long years during which period he was allowed to continue. Hence, I am of the opinion that the ends of justice will be met if he is granted 6 months gross pay i.e., gross pay he has drawn for the month of June, 1999 multiplied by six.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Kum. K. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected and pronounced by me on this the 28th day of May, 2004.

E. ISMAI, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
--	--

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 30 जून, 2004

का. आ. 1750.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत संचार निगम लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नादियाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/346/2001-आई. आर. (डी. यू.)]
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 30th June, 2004

S.O. 1750.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Nadiad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BSNL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 30-6-04.

[No. L-40012/346/2001-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE
BEFORE SHRI Y.P. BHATT,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NADIAD, GUJARAT.

Reference (ITC) No. 7/2002.

ADJUDICATION BETWEEN:

The General Manager,
 Telecom District, BSNL,
 Vallabhnagar Telephone Exchange,
 Pij Road,
 Nadiad (Gujarat)- 387 002

..... First Party.

And

Shri Babubhai Bhalabhai Patel,
 C/o. Shri Suresh G. Kaushal,
 Ma Shakti Bhavan,
 Plot No. 128/129,
 Khadi Falia,
 Godhra (Panchmahal) 389 001

..... Second Party.

Appearances:

Shri S.R. Shah and Shri A.S. Shah for the first party.

Shri J.K. Ved and Shri S.G. Kaushal for the second party.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour referred an industrial dispute between the aforesaid parties to this Tribunal for adjudication under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act vide their order No. L-40012/346/2001 (IR/DU) dated 03-06-2002. The dispute referred is to following effect:

"Whether the action of the management of General Manager Telecom District, BSNL, Nadiad in terminating the service of Sh. Babubhai Bhalabhai Patel w.e.f. 28-9-1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Shri Babubhai Bhalabhai Patel hereinafter referred to as "The workman" filed his statement of claim at Ex. 4 on 9-8-2002 whereas the Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited, to be shortly referred to as "The BSNL" filed its defence statement vide Ex. 14 on 11-7-2003. Thereafter the parties went on trial and after closing of their evidence, their arguments were heard. It is the case of the workman that he was a casual labour under the BSNL right from 1985 and his services were terminated orally on 28-9-94, that he had worked continuously and had put in service of more than 240 days however without following any procedure under the Industrial Disputes Act, without payment of notice pay or retrenchment compensation he was discharged; that at the time of his discharge he was getting Rs. 950/- as basic wages + Dearness Allowance and other benefits were being given to him; that the BSNL had also called his junior workers in 1995 and had employed them; that at the time of his discharge no seniority list was prepared or shown to him, that thus, the BSNL had violated Sec. 25F, 25G and 25H of the ID Act, that the BSNL had assured him to be taken back in its employment and when it came to his notice that his junior workers were employed by the BSNL, he had raised present dispute on 14-6-2001. The workman has stated the names of his junior workers who had been employed by the BSNL as Bharatsinh

Vaghabhai, Valsinh Balvantbhai, Kirtansinh Mohanbhai, Himatsinh Sonabhai etc. It is also stated by the workman that the BSNL had called upon him to furnish certain information (regarding the working days) and that he had furnished such information on affidavit; that as he was entitled to temporary status, he had demanded the same but the BSNL had terminated his services by an oral order on 28-9-94. The workman has accordingly requested for an award of reinstatement to his original post with continuity of service and with full back wages.

3. The BSNL filed its defence statement vide Ex. 14 contending inter alia that it is not an industry under the ID Act and hence this reference case is liable to be rejected; that the referring authority had no power to refer such dispute; that the reference being state, it is not maintainable. The BSNL has denied all the contentions and allegations made by the workman in the statement of claim. It is admitted that the workman was working as a casual worker but it is denied that he had worked from 1985 to 28-9-94 continuously and had worked for 240 days in a calendar year or that his services were continuous in terms of Section 25B of the ID Act. It is also denied that the workman was getting Rs. 950/- as his basic wages and he was discharged illegally on 28-9-94. It is submitted that the sub-divisional engineer of the BSNL was authorised to retain casual workers considering temporary nature of work; that the said engineer had taken work of laying the telephone lines, releasing connections etc. at the relevant time from the present workman but it is denied that the workman was given assurance that he would be called as and when there was work for him. It is further denied that the BSNL had employed the junior workers in 1995 and had committed breach of Sec. 25F, 25G and 25H of the ID Act. It is contended that as the workmen were to be retained on the base of necessity of work, there was no question of preparing the seniority list. It is further denied that the junior workers of the present workman were employed by the BSNL. It is contended that the workman has raised this dispute after about seven years and the alleged assurance by the officers of the BSNL is merely an excuse to justify the delay. It is denied that the workman was not at fault and hence he is entitled to reinstatement in service. It is denied that the BSNL had committed any breach of any provisions of law. It is submitted that in terms of the order of the Government to accommodate the casual workers, the BSNL had formed a committee and such workers were asked to file affidavit regarding the days of their work with the BSNL; that the committee had met on 23-2-95 and 24-2-95 but the workman had not filed affidavit during the time and later on 14-9-95 he had filed affidavit, whereafter there was no recruitment and the workman was unnecessarily raising the issue of seniority. It is further submitted that the BSNL is a public sector undertaking or the Central Government and there are rules regarding the recruitment of permanent workers which provide for issuing of advertisement, calling the names from the employment exchange, holding of interviews, selecting the candidates, preparing a list and thereafter appointment orders are issued; that the sub-divisional engineer was authorised to make recruitment of temporary casual workers and thus, the present workman was not selected after following the

prescribed procedure for recruitment; that the workman had stopped coming to work on his own and that the work which he was doing has been entrusted to the contractors as per the policy decision of the Government and hence BSNL is not need of workers and as such, the present workman cannot be reinstated in service. It is also submitted that the committee formed by the BSNL had given its report and the name of the workman was not found in the said report; that the formation of committee was a "one time settlement and was not an ongoing procedure". Accordingly, the BSNL has requested to dismiss this reference case.

4. The workman deposed at Ex. 36 wherein he stated he was employed the BSNL in 1985 and at the time of his discharge his basic wages were of Rs. 950/-; that BSNL had recorded his residential address at the time of his recruitment; that he was discharged on 28-9-94 without payment of notice pay or retrenchment compensation; that other workers were also discharged alongwith him but they were all paid notice pay and retrenchment compensation; that he had completed 240 days of service in many years; that the seniority list was not prepared at the time of his discharge; that he had received a letter from the BSNL in 1995 wherein he was asked to file affidavit in attached form; that he had filed such affidavit but till date the BSNL had not given any reply. The workman had also given names of his junior workers and stated that they were called in 1995 and were regularised in service. He also stated that no reason was cited at the time of his discharge; that the BSNL had shown its willingness during the conciliation proceedings, to pay retrenchment compensation and notice pay but he had not accepted the same. In the cross-examination, the workman admits that he had not made any application for appointment nor he was given any appointment letter by the BSNL; that he was doing the work of digging the pits, erecting the poles, laying and changing the lines etc. He has denied that he was called only when there was work for him. He has also denied that he had stopped going to work prior to 28-9-94. He has admitted that on 28-9-94 he and other fellow workers were discharged and they were all sent retrenchment compensation, but denied that as the BSNL was not having his residential address, he could not be sent notice and retrenchment compensation. He admits that certain work has been given on contract but denies that he was remaining absent on account of his agricultural work or other work. He stated that he was a member of the union but the union did not inform him about the recruitment of the erstwhile workers on the basis of their working and presence etc. He denies that Himatsinh etc. (junior workers) remained absent for less than six months and that they had filed affidavits earlier. He also denied that the BSNL had decided to take them back prior to his affidavit. He has denied that he was told that as the work was to be taken from contractors, they were discharged. He stated that he is maintaining on labour work.

5. Shri Jivabhai Shivabhai Patel who is an Assistant General Manager in the BSNL had deposed at Ex. 41 and stated the BSNL was established on 1-10-2000 prior to

that it was department of telecommunication. He narrated the procedure for recruitment of the permanent workers in the BSNL and stated that the sub-divisional officer was not authorised to recruit permanent staff; that the workman was not a permanent worker and he was not recruited after following the due procedure; that the work which the workman was doing was decided to be given to contractors in 1994-95 and as there was no work the workman was discharged alongwith many other casual workers; that thereafter the union had requested to employ as many persons as could be possible; that thereafter the BSNL had formed a committee but the present workman did not fall in the norms prescribed by the committee; that the workman and such other casual workers cannot be taken in the service as due to the introduction of mobile technology, they are not needed anymore. In the cross-examination the witness for the BSNL stated that he does not know the workman and is giving evidence on the basis of the record; that he does not know that the workman had completed 240 days of work in each year from 1985 to 28-9-94. He stated that even presently also the BSNL is giving telephone connection of land lines by charging Rs. 2000/-. He does not know whether any license is obtained under the contract labour Act but stated that there may be exception. He also stated that before discharging the workman there might be a written order; that as there cannot be any seniority of the casual workers, no seniority list was prepared. He also stated that the guidelines and norms fixed for the casual workers are based on departmental instructions.

6. No other oral evidence was led by any of the parties except as aforesaid. The written argument of the learned representative for the workman was taken into consideration and the arguments of the learned advocate for the BSNL were heard. The parties had filed documentary evidence. From Ex. 19 to Ex. 28 the workman has produced summary of the days of his presence which are authenticated by the officer of the BSNL. The same are as follows:

From	To	Days of presence
1-11-84	30-6-85	236
1-1-86	31-12-86	354
1-1-87	31-10-87	298
1-11-87	31-12-87	61
1-1-88	31-12-88	360
1-1-89	31-12-89	354
1-1-90	31-12-90	360
1-1-91	31-5-91	145
1-6-91	31-12-91	214
20-7-92	31-10-92	104
1-1-93	31-3-93	79
1-1-94	31-7-94	209

These figures of the presence of the workman shows that he had worked almost on all days in five years and in three

years he was about to complete the 240 days of service. The span of his total service as casual labour was about ten years and he was retrenched without any formality. The above presence also suggests that the workman could not have left the service on his own or remained absent for his personal work as was the defence of the BSNL. The witness for the BSNL has specifically stated that present workman and others were discharged.

7. From the pleadings and oral evidence led, it appears that admittedly the workman was discharged on 28-9-94 and was not paid notice pay or retrenchment compensation required to be paid as per Sec. 25F of the ID Act. No seniority list was prepared at the time of retrenchment of the present workman. It is stated by the witness for the BSNL that seniority list was not required to be prepared in the case of casual workers. It is not so. The casual workmen are also workmen and before retrenching them the BSNL was required to prepare the seniority list as per the relevant rules so that the rule of *last come to first go* can be maintained. Even as per the decision of Hon. Supreme Court in (1993) 23 ATC 787 Union of India V/s. Munim Singh and others, the Telecom department was required to maintain seniority list of casual workers divisionwise. It also appears from the oral evidence that certain junior workers were called by the BSNL in 1995 and were re-employed. The defence of the BSNL as it appears from the cross examination of the workman is that the workman had not filed affidavit within time and that the junior workers had filed affidavits earlier in point of time and hence he was not taken back in service, whereas the witness for the BSNL stated that BSNL had formed a committee and the workman did not fall within the norms prescribed by the said committee and hence he was not taken back in service. The workman was asked to furnish affidavit only after 30-8-1995 as can be seen from Ex. 16 which is a letter of the BSNL addressed to the workman in which address of the workman is also written. The workman does not appear to have made any delay and had filed an affidavit on 14-9-95. So, there was no question of filing affidavit late by the workman because he was asked to furnish the affidavit only after 30-8-95 and he had filed the affidavit on 14-9-95, within fifteen days. It was rather incumbent upon the BSNL to call the workman senioritywise to file affidavit in terms of Section 25H of the ID Act. The witness for the BSNL only stated that the workman did not fall within the criteria/norms prescribed by the committee. He did not throw light as to what the criteria/norms were. This Tribunal has tried to search the norms and it was found in Ex. 34, the recommendation of the committee had met on 23-2-95 and 24-2-95 and the continuous absence for the last 365 days in the cases of individual casual workers was counted downward from 25-2-95. It, therefore, follows that from 26-2-94 to 25-2-95 (365 days) a workman must have remained absent (through such workman must have been called on work and he remained absent) in whose case the committee could not

recommend the name of the casual worker for re-engagement. If we go through the presence sheet of the workman for the year 1994 which is produced at Ex. 28, it appears that the workman was very much on work in February, 1994 to 31-7-94 and in the year of 1994 he had put in 209 days of service, then how it can be said that present workman did not fall within the norms prescribed by the committee. In view of the above discussion of the evidence, this Tribunal is of the view that the BSNL had violated Sec. 25F, 25G, and 25H of the ID Act and hence the action of the management of the General Manager Telecom District BSNL Nadiad in terminating the services of the workman with effect from 28-9-94 was illegal and unjustified. One of the defences of the BSNL was that since the work which the workman doing was given on contract, he cannot be reinstated. This defence also falls to the ground in view of the fact that the BSNL itself had framed out a policy of re-engaging the retrenched casual workers, as can be seen from Ex. 34 and other documents.

8. Many decisions were cited on both the sides. It was contended by learned advocate for the BSNL that the telecom department is not an industry as held by Hon. Supreme Court but the said decision was overruled subsequently and the telecom department was held to be an industry within the meaning of the ID Act per AIR 1998 SC 656 General Manager Telecom V/s. S. Srinivasa Rao. In 2003 SCC (L&S) 1170 Incharge Govt. Hide Flaying Centre V/s. Rama Ram, the Hon. Supreme Court Stated that the termination disregarding the principle of last come to first go was not sustainable. In 1995 LLR 529 Ajaib Singh V/s. The Sirhind Co-operative Marketing-cum-Processing Service Society Ltd., it was held by Hon. Supreme Court that the provision of Limitation Act cannot apply to the industrial adjudication. In 2001 (2) GLH (UJ) 14 Gujarat Rural Housing Board V/s. Kamabhai H. Lodha it was held by our own Hon. High Court that the money payable under Sec. 25F has to be alongwith the order of retrenchment-Payment and Order must go hand in hand. Money order sent subsequent to the order of retrenchment was not in compliance of the mandatory provision of the section. And such other decisions were cited by the learned representative for the workman which I do not think necessary to refer to.

9. The learned advocate for the BSNL has also cited many decisions such as 1997 LLR 793 Bombay Telephone Canteen Employees' Association V/s. Union of India. It was held in this decision that Telecommunication department was not an industry and the employees employed therein were not workmen. That decision was overruled by a larger bench of Hon. Supreme Court subsequently in AIR 1998 SC 656 holding that the said decision cannot be treated as laying down the correct law. The next decision cited by him was 1988 (2) GLH 463 Ghelabhai Popatbhai Tarpura V/s. Agricultural Produce Market Committee, Kalawad. It was a case wherein the

workman concerned had claimed permanent status but the Hon. High Court stated that if the appointments not made in accordance with relevant recruitment rules, such person cannot claim permanent status. This decision is not applicable to present case as the workman has challenged his illegal retrenchment and claimed reinstatement which is as per the principles of the ID Act. The next decision is of 2000 Lab. I.C. 2404 Jagdish U. Nanavaty V/s. State of Gujarat, wherein it was a case of lecturers in Govt. Colleges who were not appointed after due procedure. It was held that such lecturers had no right to continue after the expiry of term of appointment. On facts, this decision cannot apply to present case as the present workman was not a lecturer and was not appointed in Govt. College. Then 1998 (year is not legible) ILLJ 447 Patel Evelin Ranchhodbhai and Gujarat Ayurved University, Jamnagar is cited. There was an ad-hoc appointment and the post for which recruitment rules were available, it was held that such ad-hoc person cannot claim a right to appointment. On facts, the said decision is also not applicable. Then the learned advocate for the BSNL has cited 1992 ILLJ 841 Dinesh Shivubha Parmar and State of Gujarat. It was a case wherein the employee was appointed on the basis of 29 days order and his appointment was liable to be terminated without notice. The employee was not engaged through the Employment Exchange. It was held that such person cannot claim equity in his favour and that the candidates recommended by the Employment Exchange formed a different class. On facts, that decision also does not apply to the facts of the present case. It is not the case of the BSNL that as the workman was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, he cannot be considered. In 1988 (2) GLH (UJ) 18 Narmada Prasad Shivprasad Mishra V/s. Shashnadhikari, Nagar Prathamik Shikshan Samittee, Ahmedabad, also it was a case that the plaintiffs were not selected through the procedure prescribed and their appointments were ad-hoc and hence their termination was not found to be illegal. The next decision cited by the learned advocate for the BSNL is (1997) 4 SCC 391 Himanshukumar Vidyarthi V/s. State of Bihar. It was a case wherein the petitioners were engaged on daily wage basis and they were not appointed in accordance with the rules but were engaged on the basis of need of the work. It was held that their disengagement from service cannot be construed to be retrenchment under the Industrial Disputes Act. It was a case in which a department of Government was concerned and Hon. Supreme Court stated that every department of the Government cannot be treated as industry. Thus as the concerned department was not an industry the workmen employed therein were not workmen and hence it was held that the disengagement from service of such employees would not amount to retrenchment under the Id Act. Thereafter some three decisions are cited on the point of back wages by the learned advocate for the BSNL. It would be appropriate to note that citing a number of

decisions without reference to the facts emerging in the case on hand has not relevance. The facts in the present case is that the workman was admittedly retrenched in violation of all the relevant provisions of the ID Act. A formula was made out by the BSNL to employ all the retrenched workers on the basis of their seniority. The workman also fell within the criteria, however he was not re-engaged, and a number of different kind of defences are raised which is really unfortunate for an organisation like the BSNL.

10. So far as the back wages are concerned, it is true that though the Limitation Act is not applicable to the industrial adjudication, the relief to be awarded could be moulded according to the circumstances of the case concerned. The workman was admittedly discharged on 28-9-94. It is his case that he was given assurance that he would be taken back in service and that even after filing of the affidavit on 14-9-95 he waited and when it came to his notice that his juniors were reemployed he had raised this dispute on 14-6-2001. Admittedly, the workman had raised dispute late by seven years. If this Tribunal had any discretion to exercise in the matter of back wages, this Tribunal cannot grant the full back wages even as the retrenchment of the workman is held to be illegal. In 1999 LLR 529 Ajaib Singh V/s The Sirhind Co-op. Marketing-cum-Processing Service Society Ltd., the workman's service was terminated on 16-7-74 and he had placed a demand on 8-12-81. The Hon. Supreme Court modified the award of the Labour Court and granted back wages from the date the dispute was raised by the workman. In the present case, I would grant 40% of back wages from the date of reference i.e. 3-6-2002. There remains nothing more to discuss and I accordingly pass the following order :

ORDER

This reference case is allowed. The termination of service of the workman Shri Babubhai Bhalabhai Patel w.e.f. 28-9-1994 is held to be illegal and the management of BSNL, Nadiad is directed to reinstate the said workman to his original post with continuity of service and 40% of back wages only from 3-6-2002 onwards, within one month from the date of publication of this award. In default where of the said workman shall be entitled to full wages from the date of such default.

There shall be no orders as to costs.

Y. P. BHATT, Industrial Tribunal

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1751.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सफ़रजंग अस्पताल के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण

नं० II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 108/89) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 2-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/21/89-आई. आर. (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 2004

S.O. 1751.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 108/89) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. II, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Safdarjung Hospital and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 2-7-2004.

[No. L-42011/21/89-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER: CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT-II, RAJENDRA BHAWAN,
GROUND FLOOR, RAJENDRA PLACE,
NEW DELHI**

I.D. No. 108/89

Presiding Officer : R.N. Rai

IN THE MATTER OF:—

RAKESH KUMAR

VERSUS

SAFDARJUNG HOSPITAL

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-42011/21/89/IR(DU) Central Government Dt. 05-10-1989 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder:—

"Whether the termination of the services of S/Shri Rakesh Kumar, Lachhman Singh, Bhopal Singh and Rajender Singh by the Departmental Canteen, Safdarjung Hospital w.e.f. 14-3-1988 is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The claimants have filed statement of claim. In the statement of claim, it has been stated that the claimant Shri Rakesh Kumar is employed since 7-1-1984 as Coupon Clerk, Shri Lachhman Singh is employed since 1-5-1984 as Wash Boy, Shri Bhopal Singh is employed since 1-4-1986 as cook and Shri Rajinder Singh is employed since 28-5-1984 as sweeper and the services of these workmen have been terminated w.e.f. 14-3-1988 without assigning any valid reason thereof.

It has been further stated that juniors to them have retained but they have been thrown out of the job. No seniority list was displayed or pasted, no notice was given

nor any notice pay was either offered or paid and no service compensation was either offered or paid to them. They have worked for more than 240 days so the termination of the services is illegal, arbitrary.

The management has filed written statement. The management has admitted some of the paragraphs of the claim and denied some of the paragraphs. It has been further submitted by the management that the management is not an industry and the workmen are not the employees so there is no relation between the employer and the employee. This Tribunal had got no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the cases of the workmen as the workmen are not the employees of an industry. It is also submitted that Trade Union and its activities are not permitted for departmental canteen employees, moreover, the question of victimization does not arise as their services were discontinued because their services were no longer required.

The workmen have filed rejoinder. In their rejoinder, they have denied all the statements of the written statement and have stated emphatically that their services have been terminated illegally. They were not adhoc employees or temporary employees and the canteen run by the management is an industry and the workmen are the workmen under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Both the parties have filed their written arguments. The management was not appearing since 25-09-2003 despite knowledge of the case. They have filed a detailed written argument. It was submitted from the side of the workmen that it is admitted to the management that the aforesaid workmen were employed in the canteen. It has also been admitted that their services were terminated w.e.f. 14-3-1988. As such they have worked for more than 240 days. Their monthly salary has also been admitted by the management. In the circumstances, the workmen were not adhoc employees as has been stated in the written statement. No appointment letter had been issued to them so it cannot be said that they were appointed on adhoc basis or purely on temporary basis. Even in the letter of termination, it has not been mentioned that they were adhoc employees. Even if, they are considered to be daily wagers, they have worked for more than 240 days and Section 25(F) is attracted.

The second point raised vehemently by the management is that the canteen run by the Safdarjung Hospital is not an industry, the workers of the canteen hold civil posts. It is to be ascertained whether the workers of the canteen are discharging the sovereign functions so they do not come under the definition of workmen under the Industrial Disputes Act. The departmental canteen has issued letter dt. 7-7-1987 in which it has been written that if there is any loss caused to the canteen, the employees will be responsible. Even they have issued letter of termination and in that letter, they have mentioned that the employees have been appointed on adhoc basis but

mere mentioning adhoc basis in the termination letter is not a proof that the employees were adhoc employees until the appointment letter has been issued to them.

That the canteen is concerned with the business of profit and loss and according to the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage judgement of the Hon'ble APEX Court if an undertaking carries on business or trade and there is profit and loss motive, that undertaking shall be deemed to be an industry.

In view of the Hon'ble Supreme Court judgement the activities of the canteen and the workmen working under them partakes of the nature of industry. My attention was drawn to the orders dt. 12-1-1982 and it has been referred to in the written arguments of the management. In this order, it has been specifically mentioned that departmental canteens were excluded from the definition of "industry" under Section 2 (J) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

It has been held in 1991 LLR 701 that a canteen run in a university is an industry and university is the employer. The canteen has been similarly run by the Safdarjung Hospital as such, the Safarjung Hospital is the employer of the workmen. The Central Government is not the employer of the workmen. From the perusal of the judgement cited above, it becomes quite vivid that the canteen run by the Safdarjung Hospital is an industry as mentioned in the Bangalore Water Supply and the law cited above, I am of the considered view that the above said canteen is an industry and the employees working therein are not directly the Central Government employees but they are the employees of the canteen as they have been appointed by the Medical Supdt. or President of the Managing Committee of that canteen. As such, the canteen is an industry and the arguments raised by the management in this respect is of no merit.

It was argued by the workmen that they should be given full wages from the date of their reinstatement. In this respect my attention was drawn to 2002 LLR 1171, The Hon'ble High Court has held that in case the workmen are reinstated, they should be given full wages. So far as this case is concerned, it has already been mentioned in the termination letter that the canteen has become sick and it is running in loss and there are heavy financial liabilities. As such, it should be considered a sick unit. In view of the financial position of the canteen, the employees are not entitled to get full back wages. The workmen have not said anything in their statement of claim as to how they maintained their subsistence and livelihood. In case there is any parental property and they are surviving on that property, they have to mention in the statement of claim. A cook, a wash boy and a sweeper cannot be sitting idle. In case he sits idle and does no work, then he must disclose the means of his subsistence.

It is settled law that the management has to prove that the workmen are not in gainful employment but from the character of the workmen and the nature of the workmen, it can never be presumed that a person who is a manual labourer will sit idle and do nothing. If he does so, he must disclose his source of livelihood and subsistence. Even a single word has not been said in the statement of claim. In view of the canteen, being a sick industry, and the workmen being the manual labourers, in the facts and circumstances of this case, the judgement of the Hon'ble High Court is not applicable in this case. I am of the considered view that taking into consideration, the heavy liabilities of the canteen and it being run in loss, the workmen should be reinstated with 25% back wages. Since they have completed 240 days and they are not adhoc or temporary employees, their service have been terminated without giving them compensation. As such, Section 25 (F) of the I. D. Act is attracted and termination of the services is illegal.

The award is replied thus:—

The termination of the services of S/Shri Rakesh Kumar, Lachhman Singh, Bhopal Singh and Rajender Singh by the Departmental Canteen, Safdarjung Hospital w.e.f. 14-3-1988 is not justified. The workmen deserve to be reinstated w.e.f. 14-3-1988 with 25% back wages.

The award is given accordingly.

Dated: 21-06-2004

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1752.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सब-डिवीजनल आफिसर-फोन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं० II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 103/89) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 2-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40011/15/88-डी. 2 (बी.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 2004

S.O. 1752.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.103/89) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. II, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Divisional Officers-Phones and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 2-7-2004.

[No. L-40011/15/88-D. 2 (B)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER: CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL CUM
LABOUR COURT-II, RAJENDRA BHAWAN,
GROUND FLOOR, RAJENDRA PLACE NEW DELHI**
PRESIDING OFFICER: R.N. RAI I.D.NO. 103/89
IN THE MATTER OF:—
DINESH KUMAR
VERSUS
SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICER-PHONES, AJMER

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-40011/15/88/D-2(B) Central Government Dt. 05-10-1989 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder:—

"Whether the action of the Sub-Divisional Officer-phones, Ajmer in terminating the service of S/Shri Dinesh Kumar, Babulal, Gopal Singh Rattan Singh Budha Bagwan, Babu Singh Ramdhan, Jitender Kumar and Pushkar Singh, Casual workman w.e.f. 1-6-1988 is legal and justified. If not to what relief the workmen are entitled to?"

The claimants have filed statement of claim. In their statement of claim, they have stated that they had been working as casual labours under the aforesaid respondent/management till 31-5-1988 continuously for the last 3 years viz. 1985, 1986 and 1987 for at least 240 days in each year or 120 days for a half year.

That the management respondent served each of the workman a notice vide No. E-50 dated 30.4.1988 of one month for termination of the services of the petitioner workmen w.e.f. 1.6.1988.

That certain petitioners/workman were called for by the said respondent/management for re-employment on, the work under them without any conditions which is annexure A-9.

That on 18-04-1987 a similar letter was also issued without any condition to some of the workman. That all the workman/petitioners has worked for more than 2-3 years upto 31-5-1988. The services of some of them were terminated previously by such notice dt. 31-3-1986. The past services of the workman had been wholly satisfactory. The total period of each of the following workman/petitioners is detailed below which stands verified by the records of the respondent/management.

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Shri Budh Bhagwan | — 826 days in 3 years |
| 2. Shri Sewa Singh | — 741 days in 3 years |
| 3. Shri Babulal | — 725 days in 3 years |
| 4. Shri Gopal Singh | — 852 days in 3.5 years |

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 5. Shri Babu Singh | — 810 days in 3 years |
| 6. Shri Sukhdeo Singh | — 964 days in 3.5 years |
| 7. Shri Rattan Singh | — 637 days in 2 years |
| 8. Shri Ramdeo Singh | — 955 days in 3.5 years |

The above mentioned period is not less than 240 days in a year and not less than 120 days in a half year in respect of each of the workmen. In addition, the services of the above mentioned workmen/petitioners were also utilized on intervening Sundays and holidays for which payment was separately made but usually not included in the verified records.

That they were shocked to receive the notice dt. 30-4-1988 stating that the petitioners/workmen would be terminated w.e.f. 1-6-88 because the cable work was over. Infact there was work under the respondent management and few casual labours junior to the petitioners/workmen were allowed to work under the respondent/management after 1-6-1988. Some of casual labours in the same department at Jodhpur had approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and succeeded to obtain stay against such termination of services and they are still in service which is annexure-II.

That the workmen most respectfully submit that the aforesaid notices of termination of their services are wholly arbitrary and violative of the provisions of section 25-F(a)(b)(c) of ID Act, 1947.

The management has filed written statement. It has been stated that shri Ramdeo Singh, Sukhdeo Singh and Sewa Singh are not parties to the reference. These three workmen have not filed their claim as they have failed to sign the statement of claim and as such, there is no proper reference or claim petition of the said workmen before this Hon'ble Court and as such, the representation is liable to be rejected. The claim has been signed and verified on behalf of 9 workmen whose names are:—

Sh. Budh Bhagwan, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Babu Singh, Sh. Ramdeo Singh, Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh, Sh. Sewa Singh, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Jitender Kumar.

The claim has not been signed and verified by Sh. Dinesh Kumar and Sh. Ramdhan and Sh. Pushkar Singh. As such they have not filed the claim though their names are in the reference, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh, Sh. Sewa Singh, and Sh. Ramdeo Singh have signed and verified the claim but their names are not in the reference of the appropriate Govt. Sh. Budh Bhagwan, Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Babu Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Jitender Kumar have signed and verified the claim and their names are under reference. These six persons have signed the claim and their names are in the reference of the Govt. The names of Sh. Ramdeo Singh, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh, Sh.

Sewa Singh are not in the reference of the state Govt. The names of Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Sh. Ramdhan, Sh. Pushkar Singh are in the reference but they have not signed and verified the claim. As such only Sh. Budh Bhagwan, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Babu Singh, Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh and Sh. Jitender Kumar have filed the claim and their names are also in the reference so only their cases can be considered.

It has been further stated that the claim is bad for non-joinder of the Ministry of Telecommunication which is owned by the Government, and therefore, Union of India is the only proper party to the dispute. The petition is liable to be rejected on this ground as well. It has been further stated that the workmen were assigned specific job for laying the cables as absolutely temporary casual workers and on the completion of the said job, there was no work left with the respondent and the work against whom the workmen were employed was of temporary nature and it came to an end on the completion of the said work and as such the workmen are not entitled to get any benefit.

It has been stated that the workmen were appointed absolutely as casual workers on the muster roll and their appointments related to the temporary work of laying the cables which was completed and there is no work at that time in existence to be given to the workmen.

That the casual labourers who are said to have obtained the stay orders from the Hon'ble Supreme Court, have no concern with the respondent and have no relevance with the case as those mazdoors have been working at Jodhpur on different work with a different wing and different employer over which the respondent/management has no jurisdiction and connection whatsoever.

That the workmen were appointed only for a specific temporary work and after the completion of the work. They are not entitled to any regularisation. The reference is bad.

The workmen have filed rejoinder. In their rejoinder, they have submitted that the claim in the above dispute is confined to only six workmen namely, Shri Babu Lal, Shri Gopal Singh, Shri Rattan Singh, Shri Budh Bhagwan, Shri Babu Singh and Shri Jitender Kumar. The other three workmen have not come to file the statement of claim. It has been stated in the rejoinder that the workmen were employed permanently and are entitled to reinstatement in service with full backwages and continuity of service. The reference of the dispute is proper. It is wrong to say that the petitioner/workmen were appointed only for a

specific temporary work and after the completion of the work, they are not entitled to any regularisation. It is submitted that the workmen are entitled to the reliefs as claimed in the statement of claim.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was submitted by the management that the three workmen have not filed claim so the claim in respect of the three workmen is not maintainable. The workmen were employed on specific object of absolutely casual in nature for laying cables and after the completion of the work, their services were no longer required. The Ministry of Telecommunication is not an industry so the CGIT has no jurisdiction. The workmen absolutely are casual workers on daily wages Muster Roll and their appointment related to temporary work of laying cables. Since there was no work, their services were terminated.

That the management has not employed any person junior to the workmen as casual worker. The present management is not empowered to employ any workmen on regular basis in any category. It is also denied that any casual worker junior to the applicant has been made regular in service. No junior worker is working or has been offered work with the management after dispensing with the services of the applicants/workmen.

It has been stated that notices on 30-4-1988 and 1-6-1988 were served upon the workmen that they will be relieved of their work after one month. A circular was issued in November 1988 for regularisation of the casual labourers who have worked for at least 240 days per year. According to the circular also these workmen have worked for 240 days prior to 31-3-1987. As such their services cannot be reinstated. It has been further stated in the circular that their names will be arranged in order of seniority with reference to the number of days of services rendered as on 31-3-1987. This has not been done by the management. It was argued from the side of the workmen that management witness has accepted that he could not say how many persons are working for laying the cables after the termination of the workmen. It indicates that there are still workmen who are engaged in laying the cables. He has also stated that some of the workmen have got stay from the Hon'ble Supreme Court and they are still working and he cannot say whether they were junior to these workmen or not. The seniority list was ready with us and he has further stated that he could not say whether it was displayed at the time of termination or not. So according to the management witness it is evident that some of the workmen have been still retained for work. It cannot be said that they are juniors to the workmen who have been retrenched.

The workmen were employed by the SDO (Phones) and they were not directly employed by the Ministry. The workmen are employed on a project for a specific period but in case the period of their service is for two years and the project is not completed within two years, the workmen deserve to be regularised under 25 FFF (2) Section. This Section reads as under :—

“Where any undertaking set-up for the construction of buildings, bridges, roads, cannal dams or other construction work is closed down on account of the completion of the work within two years from the date on which the undertaking had been set-up no workmen employed therein shall be entitled to any compensation under clause (b) of Section 25FFF but if the construction work is not so completed within two years, he shall be entitled to notice and compensation under that section for every (completed year of continuous service) or any part thereof in excess of six months.”

My attention was drawn to Bangalore water supply and sewerage Board Versus A. Rajappa and others and it was submitted that the respondent/management is not an industry. It has been submitted by the workmen that the applicant worked under SDO telephone. If the BSNL and MTNL are industries the telephone department of Ajmer is also an industry. The workmen applicants worked under SDO telephones they received payment from the SDO telephones. The telephone department is an industry as the workmen are not government servants and are not discharging sovereign functions. Therefore the law cited above of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case.

It was further submitted that the claim has been filed Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Babu Singh, and Sh. Jitender Kumar. The other persons Sh. Sukhdeo Singh, Sh. Sewa Singh, Sh. Ramdeo Singh have signed the statement of claim but there is no reference of the appropriate government regarding them. So the cases of Sh. Ramdeo Singh, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh and Sh. Sewa Singh cannot be considered. The reference is about Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Ramdhan, Sh. Jitender Kumar, Sh. Pushkar Singh, and Sh. Babu Singh. Out of these 9 workmen only Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Babu Singh and Sh. Jitender Kumar have filed the claim, Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Sh. Ramdhan and Sh. Pushkar Singh have not filed claim. So there cases cannot be considered only Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh,

Sh. Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Babu Singh, Sh. Jitender Kumar have filed statement of claim. The name of Sh. Ramdeo Singh, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh and Sh. Sewa Singh is not under reference so there cases cannot be considered. The cases of Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Sh. Ramdhan and Sh. Pushkar Singh have been referred to for consideration but they have not filed statement of claim. As such their cases cannot be considered. The cases of Sh. Babu Lal, Sh. Gopal Singh, Sh. Rattan Singh, Sh. Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Babu Singh and Sh. Jitender Kumar have been referred to by the Minsitry of labour and they have filed statement of claim and re-joinder. So, only their cases can be considered.

The workmen are entitled to be reinstated with 20% back wages from the date of their termination respectively w.e.f. 1-4-1988 and 1-6-1988. These workmen are labourers and they have been working somewhere else so 20% back wages are sufficient. The work is of perennial in nature and the labourers have been employed for laying down cables as have been admitted by the management witnesses. In view of the fact also, the workmen are entitled to regularisation and their services cannot be terminated without giving them compensation and notice. No compensation has been paid in this case.

It has been further submitted that no appointment letter has been given to the workmen. It is in their termination letter that it has been mentioned that they have been working on project. The workmen have worked for 240 days. In view of this fact also they deserves reinstatement as section 25F of the I.D. Act is also attracted and cannot be said to the Adhoc and temporary employees.

The reference is replied thus.

The action of the Sub-Divisional Officer—phones, Ajmer in terminating the services of Babulal, Gopal Singh, Budha Bhagwan, Sh. Rattan Singh, Babu. Singh and Jitender Kumar casual workman w.e.f. 1-6-1988 is not legal and justified. The workmen are entitled to be reinstated w.e.f. 1-6-1988 with 20% back wages. No reference has been made regarding Sh. Ramdeo Singh, Sh. Sukhdeo Singh and Sh. Sewa Singh, Sh. Dinesh Kumar, Sh. Ramdhan and Sh. Pushkar Singh have not filed the claim. So no relief can be given to them.

The award is given accordingly.

Dt: 21-6-2004

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1753.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार में, इलाय इन्टरप्राइजेज (पेट्रोलियम) के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण मुंबई नं. 1 के पचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 44/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/17/2003-आई. आर. (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th July, 2004

S.O. 1753.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 44/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Mumbai No. 1 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employer in relation to the management of M/s Ellath enterprises (Petroleum) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 30-6-04.

[No. L-30012/17/2003-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, MUMBAI**

Present :

Shri Justice S. C. Pandey,
Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. CGIT-44 OF 2003

Parties :—Employers in relation to the management of
M/s. Ellath Enterprises (Petroleum)

And

Their workmen

APPEARANCE :—

For the Management : Shri R.NP. Shah, Advocate

For the Workman : No appearance

State : Goa

Mumbai, dated the 15th June, 2004

AWARD

1. This is a reference made by the Central Government under clause (d) of Sub-section 1 and sub-section 2A of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act

1947 (the Act for short for adjudicating upon the following industrial dispute between the Ellath Enterprises (Petroleum) (the management for short) and Shiddu M. Shirur & 5 others (the workmen for short). The terms of the dispute are as follows :

“Whether the action of the management of M/s. Ellath Enterprises (Petroleum), COCO Outlet, HP Service Station, Vasco, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Shiddu M. Shirur & 5 others, service Assistants (as per annexure) w.e.f. 5-1-2003 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled for?”

2. The case was fixed for appearance of the parties on 27-10-2003 at Goa Camp Court sitting and on the date of workmen filed their statement of claim. The matter was adjourned for 28-11-2003 for filing written statement of the management at Mumbai. On 28-11-2003 both the parties were present and the management prayed for time to file their written statement. The matter was adjourned on 26-12-2003. On 26-12-2003 the management filed their written statement. The workmen were not present and the matter was adjourned for 20-1-2004 for filing rejoinder of the workmen. On 20-1-2004, 27-2-2004, 18-3-2004, 12-4-2004 and 30-4-2004 the workmen were not present nor filed their rejoinder inspite of notices served upon them. The next date of hearing was fixed for 1-7-2004.

3. Today, i.e. 14-6-2004 this Tribunal has received a letter from the workmen states that due to some unavoidable circumstances they do not wish to continue their dispute as they are already employed under some other management. So they want to withdraw their case.

4. Since the workmen prays for withdrawal of this case, it is disposed of by stating that there is no industrial dispute between the parties for passing an award as they have not appeared before this Tribunal.

S. C. PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1754.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हिन्दुस्तान कॉपर लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण धनबाद-2 के पचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 166/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 30-6-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-43012/16/97-आई. आर. (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th July, 2004

S.O. 1754.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. I66/98)

of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad No. 2 as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd. and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 30-6-04.

[No. L-43012/16/97-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

PRESENT :

SHRI B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial dispute under Section
10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 166 OF 1998

Parties :—Employers in relation to the management of
HCL/ICC, Mosabani Mines, Singhbhum and
their workman.

APPEARANCES :—

On behalf of the Workman : Mr. K. Chakravorty, Advocate

On behalf of the Employers : Mr. D.K. Verma, Advocate.

State : Jharkhad : Industry : Copper.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 7th June, 2004.

AWARD

1. The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-43012/16/97/IR(M), dated, the 9th June, 1998.

“Whether the action of the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd., Indian Copper Complex, Mosabani, in fixing pay of Shri Suketu Nayak, Blaster Asstt. I, Surda Centre less that S/Shri Parash Shit and Harihar Sethi though senior to them is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled for?”

2. The case of the concerned workman according to Written Statement submitted by the sponsoring union on his behalf in brief is as follows :

The sponsoring Union submitted that the concerned workman has been working as Permanent Blaster Assistant under the management. They alleged that the concerned workman is getting less wages in comparison to the workman Shri Parash Shit and Harihar Sethi who are juniors to him since 1987, though they are performing similar nature

of job and possessing the same designation. They submitted that the concerned workman was up-graded in Grade T-5 in the year 1983 though management claimed that he was upgraded with effect from 1-7-85 and his basic wage fixed @ Rs. 729/- in the said grade. The above named juniors on the contrary have been upgraded in Grade T-5 with effect from 1-12-87. The management with some ulterior motive with effect from 1-12-87 starting paying the aforesaid junior workmen @ Rs. 1388/- as basic wages while his basic wage was Rs. 1351/-. Accordingly he submitted representation to the management with prayer for higher wages in relation to the wages of junior workman but the management did not pay any heed to his prayer and for which he raised an industrial dispute which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal.

3. Management on the contrary after filing W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the Written Statement submitted on behalf of the concerned workman. They submitted that the concerned workman was appointed as Mucker on 29-4-71 and was promoted as Timber Mazdoor with effect from 1-8-73 while Parash Sethi was appointed as Mucker with effect from 27-12-71 and was promoted as Trammier with effect from 1-7-78 and Harihar Sethi was appointed as Mucker on 5-12-75 and was promoted as Blaster Assistant with effect from 1-12-79. They disclosed that initially all the three workmen were recruited as Mucker and subsequently were placed in different cadres and ultimately all of them became Blaster Assistant in Grade T-4. On 1-9-79 when the new wage settlement was implemented all of them became Blaster in T-4 and their basic wages were fixed taking into consideration the previous wages being received by them. The date of annual increment of Harihar Sethi was 5-12-84 and his basic wage was fixed @ Rs. 705/- whereas his date of annual increment was 14-12-84. In respect of Parash Shit his basic wage was fixed @ Rs. 705/- on that date. The annual increment of the concerned workman was 29-12-84 and his basic wage on that date was fixed @ Rs. 729/-. Thus after implementation of wage settlement on 1-9-79 and 1-9-83 wages of all the three workmen were fixed @ Rs. 705/- and 729/- on 5-12-84, 14-12-84 and 29-12-84. Thus although the concerned workman was senior to other workmen at the time of initial appointment as Mucker in course of time being routed through different cadres all of them merged together to one cadre of Blaster Assistant with effect from 1-9-83. As per the wage settlement dt. 23-1-87 with the union a service link advancement scheme was formulated and was given notional implementation with effect from 1-9-83. As per the aforesaid scheme the concerned workman was placed in the higher grade from T-4 to T-5 w.e.f. 1-9-83 and his wage was fixed @ Rs. 687/- whereas two other workmen were fixed in T-4 getting Rs. 669/-. When the wage settlement was implemented in 1-9-87 the concerned workman's basic wage

was fixed @ Rs. 1351/- in T-5 whereas basic wage of two other workmen was fixed @ Rs. 1328/- in T-4. They were given the benefit under the settlement dt. 23-1-87 and were placed in T-5 on 1-9-87 and their basic wage was fixed @ Rs. 1388/-. They submitted that as per the wage settlement as well as settlement relating to providing service link benefit are binding both upon the management and the workmen as a whole. As per the settlement the wages became payable to all the workmen and the settlements are arrived at taking into consideration the benefit given to maximum number of workmen. In that connection some workmen may not get benefits to the same extent as others have received. In the absence of any terms in the settlements relating to maintenance of difference of wages between different persons for all times to come no demand can be made by any person for higher wages considering that at the initial stage he was senior to certain workmen. They submitted that the wage settlement became effective with effect from 1-9-87, there was considerable increase, in the basic wages and annual increments in the new scale T-5 to give more benefits to workmen in T-5 grades. They submitted that the said settlement was drawn up in the spirit of maximum benefit to maximum persons although in certain cases certain employees may not get the same benefits. Accordingly management submitted that in view of binding nature of settlement, considering the legality and validity of the settlement duly accepted by all the workmen the grievance raised by a single person or few others cannot be the basis for declaring the settlement to be illegal and unjustified making out a new rule modifying the settlement. They submitted that they acted bonafide according to the settlement and the concerned workman cannot claim more benefit than was due to him as per the terms of settlement taking that the other two persons got better fixation benefits under the settlement. Accordingly they submitted prayer rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

4. Points to be Decided.

"Whether the action of the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd., Indian Copper Complex, Mosaboni, in fixing pay of Shri Suketu Nayak, Blaster Asstt. I Surda Centre, less than S/Shri Paresh Shit and Harihar Sethi though senior to them is justified? If not, to what relief he is entitled?"

FINDING WITH REASON

5. It appears from the record that the concerned workman with a view to substantiate his claim did not consider necessary to adduce evidence inspite of giving several opportunities. Accordingly management also declined to adduce any evidence on their behalf. Now considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides it is to be looked into if the claim of the concerned workman stands on cogent footing or not? Considering

the written statement submitted by the management I find no dispute to hold that the concerned workman initially was appointed as Mucker on 29-4-71. Paresh Shit and Harihar Sethi also got their appointment as Mucker on 27-12-71 and 5-12-75 respectively. Therefore, it is clear that at the initial stage of such employment the concerned workman was senior to Paresh Shit and Harihar Sethi. "It is the contention of the management that thereafter the concerned workman and two other workmen were placed in different cadres and ultimately when the new wage settlement was implemented all of them became Blaster Assistant in T-4. It is the further contention of the management that after implementation of wage settlement on 1-9-79 and 1-9-83 the basic wages of all the three workmen named above were fixed @ Rs. 705,729 on 5-12-84 and 29-12-84. They disclosed that though the concerned workman was senior to other two workmen at the initial stage of appointment. As mucker in course of time and being routed through different cadres all of them were merged together to one cadre as Blaster Assistant and under the wage settlement dt. 1-9-83. Thereafter as per settlement dt. 23-1-87 with the Union Service Link Advancement Scheme was formulated and was given notional implementation with effect from 1-9-83. As per the said scheme the concerned workman being senior to other two who were placed in higher scale from T-4 to T-5 with effect from 1-9-83 and his basic pay was fixed @ Rs. 687/- whereas the basic wage of other two workmen fixed @ Rs. 669/-. After implementation of settlement with effect from 1-9-87 the basic wage of the concerned workman stood @ Rs. 1351/- in T-5 whereas the basic wage of other two workmen were fixed @ Rs. 1328/- in T-4. Thereafter those two workmen got promoted in T-5 with effect from 1-12-87 and their basic wage was fixed @ Rs. 1388/-. A dispute cropped up from this place. It is the contention of the concerned workman that he is senior to other two workmen and accordingly his basic wage should be higher in comparison to the basic wage fixed for the said two workmen. It is seen that the basic wage of the concerned workman was fixed @ Rs. 1351/- with effect from 1-9-87 whereas basic wage of other two workmen was fixed @ Rs. 1388/- with effect from 1-12-87. Apparently though it transpires that the basic wage of these two workmen were higher than that of the concerned workman actually the basic wage of the concerned workman will be again higher while he will get the next increment with effect from 1-9-88. It is the contention of the management that the basic wage has been fixed on the basis of settlement entered into between them and the union and it has duly been accepted by both sides. In course of implementation of the settlement there is scope of certain anomaly but as there is no rectification clause in the settlement they did not get any scope to give any further benefit to the concerned workman in relation to his benefit. I have considered the written statement submitted by the concerned workman and in the Written statement the sponsoring union did not make

any whisper that on the basis of settlement the basic wages of the workmen working under the management were fixed. In the fixation rule 1985 it has been clearly mentioned that in case a workman's wage is fixed with effect from 1-9-83 in revised scale of pay at the same stage as the one fixed for another workman junior to him in the same cadre who is drawing wages at lower stage than him in the pre-revised scale, the senior person shall be granted the next increment in the revised scale on the same date as admissible to his junior provided the date of increment of the junior happens to fall earlier. Here in the instant case date of increment of the juniors was later than that of the date of increment of the concerned workman who is senior to them. Therefore there is no scope to say that he is getting less wages in comparison to his junior. The concerned workman got ample scope to a place his submission contradicting the fixation rules, 1985 of the management but in spite of getting scope he did not consider necessary to adduce any evidence. It should be borne into mind that the facts disclosed in the pleadings cannot be considered as substantive piece of evidence until and unless the facts are substantiated by other cogent evidence. I have carefully considered all the material facts on records and I have failed to find out any gross discrepancy that management took arbitrary and illegal decision in fixing his wages. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.

As a result, the following Award is rendered :—

"The action of the management of Hindustan Copper Ltd., Indian Copper Complex, Mosaboni, in fixing pay of Shri Suketu Nayak, Blaster Asstt. I Surda Centre less than S/Shri Paresh Shit and Harihar Sethi though senior to them is justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief."

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1755.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयर इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 33/92) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 6-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/19/91-आई. आर. (विविध)]

बी. एम. डेविड, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1755.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 33/92)

of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi-II as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Air India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 6-7-2004.

[No. L-11012/19/91-IR (M)]

B. M. DAVID, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER: CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT-II,**

**RAJENDRA BHAWAN, GROUND FLOOR,
RAJENDRA PLACE NEW DELHI**

Presiding Officer : R. N. RAI

I. D. No. 33/92

In the Matter of :—

G. D. Tewari

Versus

Management of Air India, New Delhi

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-11012/19/91-IR (M) Central Government Dt. 26-5-1992 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :—

"Whether the action of the Management of Air India, New Delhi awarding the punishment of removal from service to Shri G.D. Tewari vide management's order dated 3-4-1989 is justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

The workman has filed statement of claim. In his statement of claim it has been stated that the workman was a loader in Air India at the pay of Rs. 1975/- per month and his last drawn salary was Rs. 1880/-. It has been stated that he worked to the satisfaction of authorities and the management has given him the commendation certificate. Subsequently, he was suspended on 14-10-1998 and on 3-4-1989, he was removed from service. It has been further stated that the workman applicant fell ill seriously on 13-10-1988 and he went to the Doctor and the Doctor gave him medicine and he fell asleep so he missed the bus and he could not go to resume his duties and even he could not inform. Though it was his duty to inform the management regarding his arrival. It has been stated that a week ago from 13-10-1988, he has had discussions with Shri R.N. Sharma and Shri R. Nath in the colony so they were biased against him. When the applicant workman reached the place

of his duty, he was not willing to perform duty due to illness and as he was under the influence of medicines and he was not fit for duty but he was compelled to work and the two above said officers conspired against him and while he was in the rest room, they got him arrested from the security guards and he was medically examined and the medical report was negative. He was against medically examined and his signature was taken on plain paper and he was told that no action would be taken against him so he put his signature on the plain paper on which his signature was taken but despite taking his signature on plain paper, an enquiry was instituted against him and it was manipulated that the workman has accepted the charges levelled against him. His termination is arbitrary, illegal and enquiry has been held against the principles of natural justice and he has not been afforded opportunity to defend himself.

The Management has filed written statement. In the written statement, it has been stated that the workman has suppressed material facts. He was in the state of drunkenness whilst on duty, and he drove the equipment without any authority and he caused damage to the corporation's property and he was found absent from duty. The charges levelled against him were admitted by him by his letter but still an enquiry was held and independent witnesses were examined and before the independent witnesses, he admitted all charges levelled against him. In case the enquiry is not found fair, the management may be allowed to adduce fresh evidence before the Hon'ble Tribunal to substantiate the charges levelled against the workman. Here it is relevant to mention that the management has examined witnesses in support of the enquiry and as such fresh evidence is not required. It has been further stated that besides this incident on 12-1-1985, the workman reported for duty in the first shift and was asked to stay on overtime beyond 1530 hrs. i.e. IInd shift. It was reported against him that he did not stay on overtime and left the premises after Punching time Card "Out" at 1526 hrs. It was further reported against him that at about 2015 hrs. despite his Punching "Out", he was found near Air India Flight No. AI 308 on Bay No. 19 by Mr. O.D. Sharma and Mr. K.C. Ramachandran, Apron Supervisors on duty. He had, thus, unauthorisedly, entered the working premises despite the fact that he was off duty. It was also reported that aforesaid Apron Supervisors found the workman in abnormal state and suspected him to be under the influence of alcohol. Sr. Security Assistant was called for rendering assistance in getting him medically examined through Air India Dispensary, Palam and an Alcomasure test was conducted on him by Mr. Kishan Lal, Pharmacist on duty which gave him positive result. He was, therefore, charged with the following charges :—

- (i) Unauthorised entry into Airport Premises whilst off duty.

- (ii) Drunkenness on the premises of establishment.

He was accordingly issued a charge sheet and called upon to submit his explanation in writing within four days of the receipt of the above letter. Since the workman did not submit his written explanation within the stipulated period, the competent authority decided to hold an enquiry into the charges levelled against him and constituted the enquiry committee. During the course of enquiry proceedings, the workman admitted the charges levelled against him and consequently, the Enquiry Committee submitted its report to the competent authority. He was awarded the punishment of deduction of pay by one stage for a period of one year and suspension for 4 days on loss pay and allowances.

On 13-6-85, secondly, it has been reported that whilst the workman was on duty in the IInd shift on 13th June, 1985 at about 1500 hrs., Mr. R.N. Sharma, Apron Supervisor suspected him to be under the influence of alcohol as he was not looking in normal state. When the matter was informed to Mr. P.N. Sinha, Shift Incharge, Mr. Singh decided to take him to Air India Medical Clinic, Palam for medical test and accordingly Security Assistant Mr. A.K. Bhatnagar was called for rendering assistance. Consequently, at about 1700 hrs., the workman was taken to the Medical Clinic accompanied by Mr. A.K. Sinha, Apron Supervisor and Mr. Bhatnagar, Security Assistant for alco-measure test. At about 1715 hrs. the said test was conducted on him by Dr. Vinit Chaudhary which gave positive result. The above act on his part amounted to misconduct under Air India Employees' Service Regulations. He was, therefore, charged with the following charges :—

"Drunkenness whilst on duty".

The Competent Authority called upon the workman to submit his explanation to the above charge in writing but his explanation was not found satisfactory and an enquiry was held against him again. During the course of enquiry, the workman admitted the charges levelled against him and consequently the following punishments were awarded by the competent authority :—

- (a) Suspension for four days on loss of pay and allowances as provided under Air India Employees' Service Regulations 43(e).
- (b) Basic pay which was reduced by one stage vide our earlier punishment as well as his increment will not be restored on the due date i.e. on 1-7-1986.

All the contents of the statement of claim have been denied. It has been further stated that the workman on 13-10-1988 reported for duty in the II shift as per the Roster. At about 1545 hrs., he contacted Mr. B.K. Ramachandra, Shift-in-charge, stating that he had reported late as he missed the Staff Coach. Mr. Ramachandra in turn instructed

the workman to report to Mr. M.L. Singhal, Apron Supervisor for further instructions. The workman, however, did not report to Mr. Singhal. Further at about 1700 hrs., Mr. Ramachandra was informed that the behaviour of the workman was not normal in the canteen/rest room and he was suspected to be under the influence of alcohol. Subsequently, at about 1735 hrs., both Mr. Ramachandra and Security Personnel, Mr. Jainder Singh went to the Rest Room where they found the workman changing his clothes to go home stating that he was not on duty and had come to convey some message to his friend. Consequently, after great persuasion while the workman was being taken to the Air India Medical Clinic for Medical Test, he ran away. As a result Medical Test could not be conducted immediately.

That at about 1830 hrs. the workman unauthorisedly drove Tractor No. 3544 allocated to Mr. Jaswant Singh, Junior Operator and while entering through Gate No. 2 from the Apron side, the workman was asked by Mr. Nathe Ram, Security Guard to stop for carrying out necessary check up. The workman, however, instead of following his instructions rammed the said tractor into the barrier of the gate, thereby causing damage to both the Tractor and the Gate. As the workman was already suspected to be under the influence of alcohol for which Medical Examination could not be performed, he was finally taken to the Air India Medical Clinic at about 2020 hrs. for Medical Test. Accordingly, Medical test was conducted by Dr. Pabrai in the presence of Mr. Ramachandra and Mr. Jainder Singh which gave positive result, thus, confirming the drunkenness of the workman. He was, therefore, charged with drunkenness whilst on duty, unauthorized driving of equipment, causing damage to the Corporation's property, missing from the appointed place of work. During the course of enquiry, the workman accepted all the charges levelled against him. He admitted his guilt without any force or coercion and on the finding of the Enquiry Officer, the competent authority awarded the punishment of "Removal from Service" as provided under Regulation 43(g) of the Air India Employees' Service Regulations from the date of communication of this order to him."

The workman has filed rejoinder and in his rejoinder, he has denied all the allegations of the written statement. He was sick and his signature was taken on plain paper.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was submitted from the side of the workman that the enquiry is not fair and he has admitted his guilt under pressure, and force. There are no papers on the record regarding the previous two enquiries. The records of the third enquiry has been filed with the record. He was not provided with any assistant to defend himself during enquiry.

The management has examined his witnesses in support of the enquiry and the workman has also given

affidavit. The management has also given affidavit. The management witnesses have been cross-examined and they all support that the workman was under the influence of liquor. Shri J.L. Rai has filed affidavit and Mrs. Meenakshi Dua has filed affidavit and nothing has been extracted from their cross-examination. I have gone through the records of the enquiry. Independent witnesses have been examined and the workman has put his signature on the enquiry proceedings. He has admitted in writing that he would not give any chance for complaint onwards and in case he was found indulging in such activities in future, he would not ask for any mercy. It was submitted from the side of the workman that the witnesses during the enquiry have not been cross-examined by the workman so he has not been afforded an opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses during the course of enquiry.

It was submitted by the management that the workman himself volunteered to sign the paper and he refused to contest the case so no opportunity was given to him. His confession is voluntary and that is not under any undue pressure. It has been written in the enquiry that he voluntarily admitted all the charges contained in the charge sheet and, therefore, there is no question of contesting the same. Shri G.D. Tiwari has put his signature so Shri G.D. Tewari has admitted his guilt during the course of enquiry and he has admitted his guilt by a separate letter. Even if it is presumed that the letter was obtained under threat and force during the course of the enquiry proceedings, the guilt of the workman was found proved by the Enquiry Officer on the basis of his voluntary admission.

My attention was drawn to AIR 1968 SC 266, it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that rules of natural justice should be followed in the domestic enquiry against the workman. If allegations are denied by the workman, the burden of proving the truth of those allegations will be on the management and the witnesses called, by the management must be allowed to be cross-examined, by the workman and the latter must also be given an opportunity to examine himself and adduce any other evidence that he might choose, in support of his plea.

In 1987 (4) SC Cases, 611, is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case as it relates to court martial proceedings.

In AIR 1961 Supreme Court 1070, it has been held that under article 311(2), if the statement do not amount to clear admission of the guilt, a fresh enquiry should be held. In this case, his admission is clear cut.

During the course of enquiry and by a separate letter, the charges levelled against him were admitted by him and it was the third incident of drunkenness and committing damage to the property. There is sufficient evidence

against him in the enquiry and the two witnesses have been examined in the court from the side of the management and have proved the entire charges levelled against him and he has been afforded opportunity to defend himself and he has been given show-cause notice as per Air India Rules and Regulations and principles of natural justice have been followed during the enquiry proceedings. Since the workman has admitted his guilt, so there is no question of cross-examination and contesting the case.

In the facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that the enquiry is absolutely fair and the principles of natural justice have been followed and the law cited above are not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case. The enquiry is not liable to be set aside on any ground.

The reference is replied thus :—

The action of the Management of Air India, New Delhi awarding the punishment of removal from service to Shri G. D. Tewari vide management's order dated 3-4-1989 is justified. The workman is not entitled to get any relief as prayed for.

The award is given accordingly.

Dt. 28-06-2004.

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1756.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक आफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय सं०-II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई डी० 59/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 12012/48/96-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1756.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 59/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. II New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-12012/48/96-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER: CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM- LABOUR COURT-II, NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer : R. N. RAI

I. D. No. 59/97

In the Matter of :—

M.L. SODHI

Versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-12012/48/96-IR (B) Central Government Dt. 14-5-1997 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :—

“Whether the action of the Management of the State Bank of India, in dismissing the workman Shri M.L. Sodhi, Ex-Clerk-cum-Cashier from banks services w.e.f. 13-08-1993 is just and fair and legal? If not what relief he is entitled to and from what date?”

The claimant has filed statement of claim. In the statement of claim, it has been stated that the claimant has joined the services of the State Bank of India, BHEL Branch, Ranipur (UP) as clerk with effect from 13-4-1981 on six months probation. He was confirmed in the bank services w.e.f. 13-10-1981.

That the workman was transferred from BHEL, Ranipur branch to Sector-I, Ranipur branch on 24-12-1981.

That the workman was transferred from Sector-I, Ranipur Branch to Bhailakan Branch in Distt. Saharanpur on 16-12-1991.

That the work and conduct of the workman was very good. He was considered one of the best workers.

That the workman was falsely implicated by the management in a false case and was issued a charge sheet by the Disciplinary Authority vide his letter dt. 17-11-1992. The charges referred therein were false, baseless and cooked up. Enquiry was held but principles of natural justice were not followed in the enquiry. He was not afforded sufficient opportunity to defend himself. No defence assistant was provided to him. He could not cross-examine the witnesses of the bank. Legal practitioner was not permitted to him so he could not cross the witnesses of the management.

The following charge-sheet was issued to the workman employee :—

- A. On 26-08-1990, while working on Teller Counter, you did not account for in the branch, books a sum of Rs. 1500/-, tendered by a account holder for deposit in their Savings Bank Account No. 1045. Instead you made a fake credit entry of Rs. 1500/- in the pass book of Sarvshri Bansal, as well as in the Transaction Sheet before arranging for the transfer of balance from inoperative account to running ledger.
- B. On 13-12-1990, while officiating as OJMOS-I to conceal your act of defalcation, you transferred an inflated amount of Rs. 1623/8 as against Rs. 123/81 from the aforesaid in operative Savings Bank account to running ledger and passed yourself the relative debit/credit vouchers, whereas you were not authorized to pass debit to Savings Bank Inoperative accounts.

The above charges, if established, would amount to gross misconduct as per provisions of para 521.4 (J) of the Sastri Award.

You are therefore, hereby instructed to submit your explanation in defence in writing, to the undersigned regarding the above charges within seven days from the date of receipt of this charge sheet, failing which it will be presumed that you have no reply to submit in this regard and we shall proceed accordingly.

As such, two charges were levelled against him. The charge is regarding misappropriation of Rs. 1500/- tendered by account holder for deposit in his Savings Banks account No. 1405 but the workman made a fake credit entry in the pass book of Shri Bansal as well as in the transaction sheet before arranging for the transfer of the balance from the inoperative account to the running account. So he made false credit entries in the hope of transferring the same amount from in operative accounts. It has been further alleged that on 31-10-1990, he transferred an inflated amount of Rs. 1623.81 as against Rs. 123.81 from the aforesaid inoperative savings bank account to running ledger though he was not authorized to pass debit Savings Bank Inoperative Accounts.

It has been alleged in the written statement that he has committed grave misconduct. It has been stated in the statement of claim that the management has neither filed any document in support of the charges nor produced any oral witness to substantiate the charges. The findings of the disciplinary authority were based neither on any oral testimony nor documentary evidence. The Enquiry Officer acted mala fide and against the principles of natural justice. He was a biased person and acted on the dictates of the

management. Therefore, the enquiry officer submitted false, baseless and perverse findings.

That the decision of dismissal from service by the disciplinary authority was based on the above sham show. The findings of the Enquiry Officer were based completely on confessional statement obtained from the workman under duress and inducement. The Disciplinary Authority acted against his commitment and assurances. He acted arbitrarily, mala fide and against the principles of natural justice. Though a personal hearing was granted to the workman but it was granted just to complete the formalities. The workman was finally dismissed illegally by the Disciplinary Authority on the 7th of August, 1993. His confessional statement was not voluntary but it was taken under undue pressure and assurances that no action will be taken against him. Enquiry is mere a formality.

That the workman had put in 12 years unblemished service. The management has not given any cognizance or consideration on 12 years old good past record of the workman.

The management has filed written statement. In the written statement, all the allegations of the statement of claim have been denied.

That the charges were absolutely correct and the workman accepted the same unequivocally repeatedly.

That after receiving the charge sheet dt. 6th June, 1992, the workman submitted his written reply admitting the charges in unequivocal terms vide his letter dt. Nil. However, since due to a clerical error, the SB Account number was not correctly mentioned in the charge sheet, it was found necessary to send another charge sheet correctly mentioning the SB Account number instead of issuing merely a corrigendum to the earlier charge sheet dt. 6th of June, 1992. The management issued a fresh charge sheet dt. 17-11-1992. Earlier also, he had confessed his misconduct and later reiterated the same vide his letter dt. Nil. In the domestic enquiry, the workman remained absent on first two dates i.e. 12-3-1993 and again on 26-3-1993 and sent adjournment applications by post which was granted by the enquiry officer and again on 15-4-1993, he was present in the enquiry. On this date, on being asked about the charges levelled against him in the charge sheet dt. 17-12-1992, the workman unambiguously and unequivocally admitted the charges.

The claimant has filed rejoinder. In his rejoinder, he has reiterated the averments of his statement of claim and he has stated that the admission was not voluntary but it was based on the assurances that no action will be taken against him.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was submitted from the side of the workman that he was assured that no action would be taken against him in case he voluntarily admits the charges and on the basis of their assurance, he admitted the charges. So merely on the basis of his admission, the charges cannot be deemed to be proved. He has sent letter dt. 28-8-1991 in which he has mentioned that the entry which has been shown on 28-8-1990 has been done by bonafide mistake and he assured the Branch Manager that in future, he would not commit such mistakes and he apologised for the same. On this letter, it has been written "letter written under duress." In the enquiry proceedings dt. 15-4-1995, Shri A.S. Verma, Chief Manager, B.B. Jindal, Deputy Manager and M.L. Sodhi were present. The enquiry officer asked the workman whether he admitted that he has read the charges and it was further asked whether he understood the charges and he replied that he understood the charges well. It was further asked by the Enquiry Officer whether he accepted the charges brought out on the charge sheet. The employee replied that he confessed the charges through out on the charge sheet. The Enquiry Officer again read the charges serially and again asked whether he confessed the charges, the workman replied that he confessed the charges in toto. Again the workman employee was asked to re-confirm his confession and he said that he confirmed the confession. The charges were again read out and again he confessed the charges and confirmed his confession and it has been written that he has confessed the charges without fear and pressure. Again the confession was made in the presence of Shri Sunil Kumar, Clerk-cum-typist who is the President of the State Bank of India Staff Association, Unit Sector-1, BHEL, Ranipur Branch. The workman was allowed to explain the compelling circumstances leading to the lapses committed by him before the disciplinary authority for a sympathetic and kind consideration. His assurance was also noted down by the Enquiry Officer, that he would never commit such lapses and mistakes in future.

My attention was drawn to 2002 (94) FLR 354, the Hon'ble Karnataka High Court has held that it is unnecessary for the Board to hold any enquiry. After all, what is required is as to ascertain omissions and commissions in the matter of cash transactions. When the same is admitted, the conducting of an enquiry would be nothing but an empty formality. The courts have accepted that in the case of admission no enquiry is necessary and not withholding his service for a long time, he has to be shown the door for his acts of misappropriation.

It has been held in 2000 Supreme Court cases (L & S) 830 that the bank deals with public moneys. Misappropriation by an employee of a bank is

misappropriation of public moneys and must be treated very differently. Misconduct such as this cannot be treated as lightly as it has been done. In this case also, there is misappropriation of money and the charges have been admitted by the workman. In the circumstances, enquiry has been held and the workman has admitted his charges in the enquiry proceedings thrice. His confessional letter is sufficient to hold him guilty.

In 1981 (43) FLR 194, the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court has held that the burden to prove that order of termination is illegal is on the workman. In case, the workman does not appear, it shall be deemed that he has not proved that his acts were not illegal. 1984 (49) FLR Page 38 is not relevant in the facts and circumstances of the case. In 1999 LLR page 1036, it has been held that it is for the workman to prove as to how enquiry conducted against him is illegal or invalid.

In 1999 LLR Page 1142, a lower punishment was given as meager amount was involved in this case. Meagre amount is not involved so this law also is not applicable.

In 1996 (1) LLJ 811, SC, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that in case there is admission of guilt, punishment of dismissal from service does not call for interference having regard to the proved charge of misappropriation of funds. The charge sheeted employee has categorically and willingly without any undue pressure has admitted his guilt before the President of the Union and typist-cum-clerk and the enquiry officer and the Branch Manager. It cannot be said that his confession is under pressure, undue influence or assurances of not taking any action against him. By his voluntarily confession, the charges stand proved and the enquiry is fair and principles of natural justice have been followed. The enquiry report is not liable to be set aside and the workman employee is not entitled to get any relief. The punishment of dismissal without service is not victimization in the facts and circumstances of this case.

The award is replied thus :—

The action of the management of the State Bank of India in dismissing the workman Shri M.L. Sodhi, Ex-Clerk-cum-cashier from banks services w.e.f. 13-08-1993 is just and fair and legal. The workman applicant is not entitled to get any relief as prayed for.

The award is given accordingly.

Dt. 23-06-2004.

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1757.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई. डी. 13/93) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 05-07-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-12012/208/92-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1757.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 13/93) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. II, New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-12012/208/92-IR (B. I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,

Rajendra Bhawan, Ground Floor,
Rajendra Place, New Delhi

Presiding Officer : R.N. Rai

I.D. No. 13/93

In the Matter of :—

Babu Ram

Versus

Management of State Bank of India

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-12012/208/926-IR(B)III Central Government Dt. 19-01-1993 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :—

“Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India in dismissing Shri Babu Ram, Clerk from service with effect from 17-1-1992 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to and from what date?”

The claimant has filed statement of claim. In the statement of claim, it has been stated that the workman was working as a Clerk-cum-Cashier at Mangol Puri Branch of the bank.

That the Branch Manager of Mangolpuri Branch out of personal ill-will and biasedness of the Regional authorities, issued letters of charge-sheet dated 20-08-1990 and 22-09-1999, respectively to the workman whereby the following charges were levelled against him :

LETTER NO. R. III/PCF/807 DT. 20-09-1990

“It has been decided to initiate disciplinary action against you on the following charges :—

That you had false credit entries in your own account and in three other accounts cited below and also authenticated all the entries with an intention to defraud the bank.

(a) SHRI BABOO RAM AND SHAKUNTALA S.B. ACCOUNT NO. 7681

Date	Particulars	Amount of Credit
20-12-1989	By cash	3000/-
6-1-1990	By cash	5000/-

(b) MRS. USHA SHARMA S.B. ACCOUNT NO. 18434

2-12-1989	By cash	2000/-
-----------	---------	--------

(c) SHRI V. BAJAJ V.A. NO. 1/140

2-12-1989	By cash	10,000/-
-----------	---------	----------

(d) SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD GUPTA S.B. A/C NO. 90 18528

8-1-1990	By B.T.	8680/-
----------	---------	--------

The above account holders withdrew the money from their accounts due to the credit balance credited on account of such fictitious entries made by you in their above accounts. As a result of which all the above accounts were showing debit balances when the fictitious entries were subsequently deleted by you. In order to adjust the overdrafts created in the said account of detection of fictitious entries made by you, you deposited the money in their accounts subsequently through cash/transfer from other accounts details given below. The relative credit vouchers have also been prepared by you which do not bear the signatures of accounts holders. It is obvious that you had unauthorisedly collected deposits from them on the Bank's behalf but not accounted for the same at the appropriate time.

(A) SMT. USHA SHARMA ACCOUNT NO. 18434

Date	Particulars	Amount	Remarks
6-12-1989	By cash	5000.00	Pay in Slip prepared by you. It does not bear the account holder's signatures.
1-1-1990	By B.T.	15000.00	Amount transferred from C/A No. 404 of M/s. Vikash Fashion through a debit voucher confirmed by Prop. of the firm.

(B) S/B ACCOUNT NO. 18528 OF SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD GUPTA

8-2-1990	By cash	8680.00	The credit voucher prepared by you and signed by you as Jagdish Prasad.
----------	---------	---------	---

3. That your raised the loan of Rs. 5000 from M/s. Vikash Fashions which is against your service rules.
4. You have made the unauthenticated entries in the pass book of Mrs. Usha Sharma S/B A/C No. 18434.

The above charges if proved, would tantamount to gross misconduct in terms of paragraphs 521(4)(J) of Sastry Award read with paragraph 18.28 of Desai Award.

You are, therefore, hereby instructed to submit your explanation in writing, to the undersigned within three days from the date of receipt of this letter failing which it will be presumed that you have nothing to say in the matter and the bank shall proceed accordingly."

LETTER NO. S.L. PCFE DATED 22-9-1990

It has been decided to initiate disciplinary action against you on the following charge:—

- "1. That you made false credit/debit entries in your own savings bank account No. 7681 and also authenticated all the entries with an intention to defraud the bank by using the Bank's funds as below:—

Further, you also altered the credit entry dated 10-10-1988 of Rs. 1080 in your above account to read as Rs. 7080 and withdrew a sum of Rs. 7000 on 14th October, 1988.

The above overdraft created by amounts withdrawn by you as a result of above fictitious entries made by you in your account was adjusted by you by depositing cash/transfer entry as detailed below:—

1. Rs. 2000 deposited in cash on 28-3-1988.
2. Rs. 7000/- transferred from Savings Bank 12505.

3. Rs. 4000 deposited in cash on 27-6-1988.
4. Rs. 9400 deposited in cash on 18-1-1989.
5. Rs. 1000 transferred on 21-1-1989.
6. Rs. 3400 deposited in cash on 27-1-1989
7. Rs. 300 deposited in cash on 28-1-1989.
8. Rs. 1700 deposited in cash on 30-1-1989.

The above changes if proved would tantamount to gross misconduct in terms of para 521(4) (J) of Sastry Award read with paragraph 18.28 of Desai Award.

You are, therefore, hereby instructed to submit your explanation, in writing, to the undersigned within 3 days from the date of receipt of this letter failing which it will be presumed that you have nothing to say in the matter and bank shall proceed accordingly."

A true copy each of the letter of charge sheet dated 20-08-1990 are attached and marked as Annexures W-1 and W-2 to this statement of claim.

5. That the workman denied the charges.
6. That the Disciplinary authority suspended the workman vide their letter dt. 18-07-1990.

That the Enquiry Officer Shri Manohar Lal conducted the enquiry into the charges levelled against the workman in a biased manner and in utter disregard to the principles of natural justice and submitted his findings holding the workman guilty of all the charges except charge No. 4 of charge sheet dated 20-08-1990.

It has been further submitted that findings returned by the Enquiry Officer are perverse and no person properly instructed in law could have arrived at the findings as were returned by the Enquiry Officer on the basis of material and evidence on record.

It has been further stated that principles of natural justice have not been followed and he has not been given full opportunity to defend himself. He was not issued show-cause notice and his explanation was not considered. He was not given personal hearing at the time of awarding the punishment. The final hearing were fixed on 9-12-1991 but the order was passed on 3-12-1991, as such no personal hearing was given to him before awarding the punishment.

That the management has filed written statement. It has been stated in the written statement that the workman has committed grave misconduct as is apparent from the charge-sheet. He misappropriated several amounts and after giving show-cause notice, an enquiry was instituted against him. The reply was not satisfactory so the charge sheet was issued to him providing him all the papers and an enquiry officer was appointed.

The enquiry officer held enquiry and the workman fully participated in the enquiry. Enquiry Officer gave his findings based on the evidence that was adduced during the enquiry.

All the paragraphs of the statement of claim have been denied and it has been asserted that the enquiry is fair and according to the principles of natural justice. The award of punishment of dismissal without notice was given because of his grave misconduct of embezzlement of money from several accounts.

The workman has filed rejoinder. In his rejoinder, he has denied all the paragraphs of the written statement and he has asserted that he was innocent and he has nothing to do with the embezzlement alleged against him. He was innocent and fair and he was falsely implicated.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was submitted from the side of the workman that it is alleged that the misappropriated money from his own savings bank account 7681 and authenticated all the entries with an intention to defraud the bank by using the banks funds. He withdrew a sum of Rs. 7000/- on 14th October, 1988. He had made false credit and debit entries in his own account No. 7681 and also authenticated all the entries with an intention to defraud the bank. He had a balance of Rs. 1080 in his own account. But he committed forgery and altered the credit entry dt. 10-10-1988 and made 1080 to be read as 7080 and he withdrew Rs. 7000/- on 14th October, 1988. He adjusted his own account by depositing cash and transfer entry. In this way, he temporarily embezzled Rs. 6000/- from his own account besides he prepared slip on the account holder Usha Sharma and Jagdish Prasad. The credit vouchers and the slip prepared by him and the amount transferred by him was signed by him. In this way, he misappropriated money from the account of Smt. Usha Sharma and Sh. Jagdish Prasad.

It was further submitted from the side of the workman that the handwriting expert produced in the enquiry has said that apparently the signature was of the CSE. He has not clearly given opinion that it was in the handwriting and signature of the CSE. I have gone through the evidence of the handwriting expert and he has clearly mentioned that forgery was committed by the charge-sheeted employee. As such, the fraud that has been committed by the charge-sheeted employee is supported by the handwriting expert also and it is also supported by the fact that he has deposited the money in the aforesaid accounts himself.

It was further submitted from the side of the workman that the other account holders such as Smt. Usha Sharma and Sh. Jagdish Sharma have not been produced as witness in the course of the enquiry.

It was submitted by the management that the workman himself deposited the amount withdrawn from their account and false transfers have been made in the above two accounts but it has been corrected by depositing the amount. As such, the evidence of those two bank holders was not necessary.

It was argued from the side of the workman that he was given the date of personal hearing as 9th December, 1991 at 10.30 AM but the hearing was concluded on 3rd December, 1991 but a letter has been submitted from the side of the management from which it is vivid that due to urgency, the date of 9th December, 1991 has been changed to 3rd December, 1991 and he was heard at the time of awarding punishment so personal hearing was given to him.

My attention was drawn to 1974—3 Supreme Court cases 103. This law is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case as there is not a solitary witness but three witnesses have been examined.

My attention was drawn to 1997 (6) Supreme Court cases 339, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the allegation of biasedness should be raised during the departmental enquiry. The allegation of biasedness, not made at the inception of the enquiry but made when show cause notice was issued to the charged officer after the enquiry report, is immaterial.

In 1977—2 Supreme Court cases 491, it has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that strict rules of Evidence Act are not applied in departmental enquiries but still the enquiry should be fair and principles of natural justice should be followed and if that has been done, there should be no interference from the court.

The workman has fully participated in the enquiry. He has been given full opportunity to defend himself and there is sufficient evidence before the enquiry officer to hold him guilty so judgement of the Hon'ble Apex Court referred to above is applicable.

My attention was drawn to 1990 II LLJ 1989, AIR 1952, ASSAM 129, AIR 1960 KERALA 279 AND 1992(3) SUPREME COURT CASES 473.

I have gone through all the citations. Only AIR 1952 ASSAM 129, the question of sufficiency of evidence has been discussed by the Hon'ble High Court and it has been decided that the material witnesses should be produced. In this case, the handwriting expert has been examined and so far as the handwriting is concerned, he is the only material witness. All the material witnesses have been examined during the course of enquiry in the court also.

It has also been held by the Hon'ble Court that the inference regarding the hand writing can be drawn by comparison of the disputed and admitted by the officers

of the bank and the court may scrutinise the same. I have carefully examined the questioned hand writing with the admitted one. It is quite clear that all the disputed papers bear the hand writing of the workman and the hand writing expert unambiguously and categorically corroborates it.

In 1992 (3) Supreme Court cases 473, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that in case reasonable inferences from other facts is established by evidence such inferences cannot be termed as surmises and conjectures. The opinion of the enquiry officer is not based on conjectures and surmises but it is based on the evidence of the handwriting expert and evidence of the other witness. As such, the charges which were levelled against him except charge No. 4 have been proved by cogent and reasonable evidence and it appears that the findings of the enquiry officer have been given on evidence on the record and there is sufficient evidence to prove all the charges except charge No. 4 and no interference is required. The law cited by the workman are not applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case and I am of the considered view that the enquiry is fair and reasonable and no interference is called for to set aside or alter the findings of the enquiry. The charges levelled against the workman have been proved by cogent and sufficient evidence and principles of natural justice during the enquiry have been followed. Hence the findings of the enquiry officer are maintainable and the punishment awarded to the workman is also justified. An employee who commits grave misconduct and defrauds the bank should not be given a lower punishment than that of dismissal without notice. As such the workman is not entitled to get any relief.

The award replied thus :—

The action of the Management of the State Bank of India in dismissing Shri Babu Ram, Clerk from service with effect from 17-1-1992 is legal and justified and the workman is not entitled to get any relief as claimed.

The award is given accordingly.

Date : 30-06-2004

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

क्र. आ. 1758.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. II, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई. डी. 151/91) को प्रकटित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 05-07-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 12012/295/91-आई. आर. (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1758.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. ID No. 151/91) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No. II New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-12012/295/91-IR (B. I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER : CENTRAL
GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II,
RAJENDRA BHAWAN, GROUND FLOOR,
RAJENDRA PLACE
NEW DELHI**

Presiding Officer : R.N. Rai

I.D. No. 151/91

IN THE MATTER OF :—

MANGU

Versus

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-12012/295/91-IR(B-1) Central Government Dt. 11-02-1991 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder :—

“Whether Shri Mangu was a workman of Reserve Bank of India? If so, whether the action of the Reserve Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Mangu w.e.f. 26-12-1990 was justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?”

The claimant has filed statement of claim. In the statement of claim, it has been stated that the workman applicant was working in Reserve Bank of India, NCC Building, Connaught Place, Jeewan Bharti Building, New Delhi w.e.f. 27-08-1988 as sweeper and he was getting Rs. 750/- per month.

That the management was pleased with him. Shri Manmohan Singh Rekharao, Director has issued identity card to the applicant 24-10-1989. Its number is 210 and the Director also verified the photo of the applicant and the officer of the RBI put his signature while issuing the identity card. The copy of the identity card is annexed

with the record. It has been signed by the Director marked at "A" and officer of the Department marked at "B".

The workman was sweeping and clearing the 6th and the 7th floor and bringing stationary to NCC office and he served tea to the officers of the management and brought milk from outside. He has further stated that he put his signature on the attendance register which was verified by the officers of the RBI and payment was made to him after affixing the ticket on which his signature was taken.

The officers of the bank took his signature on the letters so the applicant always remained temporary. The workman performed duty of cleaning furnitures and sweeping the 6th and the 7th floor of the said building. When he requested that he should be made permanent, the officers removed him from service on 26-12-1990 without any reason charge-sheet and without any reason which is illegal and unjust.

He sent demand letters to the officers but no reply was given to him and he was told that he is a worker of the M/s Premier Security Services but neither the management nor the M/s Premier Security Services have any agreement and they have not any regn. Certificate. He worked on the directions of the officers of the bank and under the supervision of the bank.

The management has filed written statement. In the written statement, some of the paragraphs have been admitted while most of the paragraphs have been denied and additional objections have been given. In the additional statement, it has been stated that the present dispute raised by Delhi Office & Establishment Employees' Union (herein after referred to as the Union) an outside Union, is not an industrial dispute as the Union does not have any following of class III or IV workmen in the RBI nor the dispute has been espoused by a substantial number of workmen of the RBI. It is well settled that an individual dispute cannot become an industrial dispute as contemplated under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, unless the dispute is espoused by a substantial number of workman in an Organisation or is espoused by a Union having following of substantial number of workmen in the Organisation. As such, the present dispute is not an industrial dispute as contemplated under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Dispute Act and merits dismissal on this ground alone.

It has been stated that the National Clearing Cell (NCC), RBI, New Delhi is presently functioning on the 6th and the 7th floor along with the other departments of RBI in Jeevan Bharti Building, Connaught Place, New Delhi. It was not possible to clean and sweep the entire building. Therefore, quotations from various firms were called for in April, 1987 by the Estate Department of the bank for cleaning and maintenance of these two floors and the contract was ultimately awarded to M/s Security Guards

Corporation, a subsidiary of M/s Premier Security Services P) Ltd. Copies regarding the work order, the payment and agreement have been attached with the record. Shri Mangu is one of such persons engaged by M/s. Security Guards Corporation. He might have been engaged by the said firm to do the work of other institutions also as his work was not taking much time in the NCC. The wages payable to such persons including Shri Mangu was paid by the said firm. The persons were not on the Pay-rolls of the RBI at any point of time and further there is no sanctioned post of sweeper against which such persons could have been working. Since the aforesaid persons were not on the Pay-rolls of the Bank, the question of demanding any service benefits by them from the bank does not arise. It has been further submitted that the claimant was not employed by the bank and cannot be treated as workman of the bank. The claimant has filed rejoinder. In his rejoinder, he has state that he has filed the case under Section 10 read with 2-A of the Industrial Dispute Act so there is no need of espousal of the union. He can himself raise the matter of termination of his services. It has been further asserted that all the allegations of the written statement are false. He was not working under the contractor but he was the direct employee of the management and he performed the duty of cleaning, sweeping bringing tea etc. He put his signature on the register and did other misc. work.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was argued from the side of the workman that the workman applicant is a direct employee of the RBI and he has been issued identity card from the NCC Office. I have perused the record. The Photostat copy of the card has been filed. It is in the name of Mangu and number is 210 C/o Premier Security Corporation. As such, the identity card has not been issued directly to Mangu but is has been issued under the care of M/s Premier Security Corporation.

It was further submitted from the side of the workman that management has given direction to the Security Officer to allow the workman to enter the premises as he is an employee of the RBI.

It was submitted from the side of the workman applicant that these papers are sufficient to prove that he was the direct employee of the bank and not an employee of the Contractor.

It was submitted from the side of the management that the said department has called for quotations as per annexure-IA and M/s. Security Guard Corporation was award the work of cleaning and sweeping and there is an agreement between M/s Security Guard Corporation and the management, the management has agreed to pay Rs. 600/- to four sweepers plus 10% service charge and the management has to supply the cleaning material. The substantial question is whether the name of Mangu is in

the list of the employees of M/s Security Guards Corporation or not. Annexure III shows that Mangu's name has been entered at Sl. No. 10 on the said Security Guards Corporation for cleaning of NCC. It shows that Mangu was an employee of M/s Security Guards Corporation. Annexure-IV shows that Mangu received payments from the M/s Security Guard Corporation. Even a single paper has not been filed by the workman that he has received the payment from the management. The payment to the Security Guards Corporation has been made lump sum by the management. The employment form has been filled up under the Security Guards Corporation. This paper also indicates that the workman was a contractor's man and he was not an independent employee of the management. It establishes the fact that the payment was made to Mangu through Security Guards Corporation. His employment form was filled up through the said firm and his name is in the workers of M/s Security Guard Corporation.

My attention was drawn to 1985 (50) FLR 20 and it was argued that it was a contract for service but this law is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case as it is explicit from the record that he was an employee of Security Guards Corporation.

1978 (37) FLR 136 SC is regarding the test of employer and employee relationship. The Hon'ble APEX Court has held that there should be supervision and control of the management and payment should be made by the management but in this case, neither the payment has been made by the management to the workman nor there is any paper regarding the supervision of the management.

My attention was drawn to 1995 LLR 552. In it, it has been held that an industrial dispute can be raised for abolition of contract labour system but there is no such case in this dispute. As such, from the perusal of the record, it becomes obvious that Shri Mangu was an employee of M/s Security Guards Corporation. He was not the employee of the management so he has got no right of reinstatement or regularisation.

The rulings cited by the workman are not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case. The workman has not established that he was an employee of the RBI. The award is replied thus:—

Shri Mangu was not a workman of Reserve Bank of India. The action of the Reserve Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Mangu w.e.f. 26-12-1990 was justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

The award is given accordingly.

Dt. 28-06-2004.

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1759.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं०-II नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई. डी. 152/91) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 12012/296/91-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1759.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 152/91) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. II New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Reserve Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-12012/296/91-IR (B. D)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER: CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, RAJENDRA BHAWAN, GROUND FLOOR, RAJENDRA PLACE NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer: R.N. Rai

I.D. No. 152/91

IN THE MATTER OF:—

KRISHANKUMAR

VERSUS

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

AWARD

The Ministry of Labour by its letter No. L-12012/296/91-IR(B-3) Central Government DT. 11-2-1991 has referred the following point for adjudication.

The point runs as hereunder:—

"Whether Shri Krishan Kumar was a workman of Reserve Bank of India? If so, whether the action of the Reserve Bank of India in terminating the services

of Shri Krishan Kumar w.e.f. 07-01-1991 was justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

The claimant has filed statement of claim. In the statement of claim, it has been stated that the workman applicant was working in Reserve Bank of India, NCC Building, Connaught Place, Jeevan Bharti Building, New Delhi w.e.f. 01-08-1987 as sweeper and he was getting Rs. 750/- per month. That the management was pleased with him. Shri Manmohan Singh Rekharao, Director has issued identity card to the applicant on 24-10-1989. Its number is 209 and the Director also verified the photo of applicant and the officer of the RBI put his signature while issuing the identity card. The copy of the identity card is annexed with the record. It has been signed by the Director marked at "A" and officer of the Department marked at "B".

The workman was sweeping and clearing the 6th and the 7th floor and bringing stationary to NCC office and he served tea to the officers of the management and brought milk from outside. He has further stated that he put his signature on the attendance register which was verified by the officers of the RBI and payment was made to him after affixing the ticket on which his signature was taken.

The officers of the bank took his signatures on the letters so the applicant always remained temporary. The workman performed the duty of cleaning furnitures and sweeping the 6th and the 7th floor of the said building. When he requested that he should be made permanent, the officers removed him from service on 7-1-1991 without any chare-sheet and without any reason which is illegal and unjust.

He sent demand letters to the officers but no reply was given to him and he was told that he is a worker of the Premier Security Service but neither the management nor the Premier Security Service have any agreement and they have not any regn. Certificate. He worked on the directions of the officers of the bank and under the supervision of the bank.

The management has filed written statement. In the written statement, some of the paragraphs have been admitted while most of the paragraphs have been denied and additional objections have been given. In the additional statement, it has been stated that the present dispute raised by Delhi Office & Establishment Employees Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union) an outside Union, is not an industrial dispute as the Union does not have any following of Class III or IV workmen in the RBI nor the dispute has been espoused by a substantial number of workmen of the RBI. It is well settled that an individual dispute cannot become an industrial dispute as contemplated under Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, unless the dispute is espoused by a substantial number of workmen in an Organisation or is espoused by a Union having following of substantial number of

workmen in the Organisation. As such, the present dispute is not an industrial dispute as contemplated under Section 2 (k) of the Industrial Dispute Act and merits dismissal on this ground alone.

It has been stated that the National Clearing Cell (NCC) RBI, New Delhi is presently functioning on the 6th and the 7th floor alongwith the other departments of the RBI in Jeevan Bharti Building, Connaught Place, New Delhi. It was not possible to clean and sweep the entire building. Therefore, quotations from various firms were called for in April, 1987 by the Estate Department of the bank for cleaning and maintenance of these two floors and the contract was ultimately awarded to M/s. Security Guards Corporation, a subsidiary of M/s. Premier Security Service (P) Ltd. Copies regarding the work order, the payment and the agreement have been attached with the record. Shri Krishan Kumar is one of such persons engaged by M/s. Security Guards Corporation. He might have been engaged by the said firm to do the work of other institutions also as his work was not taking much time in the NCC. The wages payable to such persons including Shri Krishan Kumar was paid by the said firm. The persons were not on the Pay-rolls of the RBI at any point of time and further there is no sanctioned post of sweeper against which such persons could have been working. Since the aforesaid persons were not on the Pay-rolls of the Bank, the question of demanding any service benefits by them from the bank does not arise. It has been further submitted that the claimant was not employed by the bank and cannot be treated as the workman of the bank. The claimant has filed rejoinder. In his rejoinder, he has stated that he has filed the case under Section 10 read with 2 - A of the Industrial Dispute Act so there is no need of espousal of the union. He can himself raise the matter of termination of his services. It has been further asserted that all the allegations of the written statement are false. He was not working under the contractor but he was the direct employee of the management and he performed the duty of cleaning, sweeping, bringing tea etc. He put his signature on the register and did other misc. work.

Heard arguments from both the sides and perused the papers on the record. It was argued from the side of the workman that the workman applicant is a direct employee of the RBI and he has been issued identity card from the NCC Office. I have perused the record. The Photostate copy of the card has been filed. It is in the name of Krishan Kumar and number is 209 c/o M/s. Premier Security Corporation. As such, the identify card has not been issued directly to Krishan Kumar but it has been issued under the care of M/s. Premier Security Corporation.

It was further submitted from the side of the workman that management has given direction to the Security Officer to allow the workman to enter the premises as he is an employee of the RBI.

It was submitted from the side of the workman applicant that these papers are sufficient to prove that he was the direct employee of the bank and not an employee of the Contractor.

It was submitted from the side of the management that the said department has called for quotations as per annexure-I and M/s. Security Guards Corporation was awarded the work of cleaning and sweeping and there is an agreement between M/s. Security Guards Corporation and the Management. The management has agreed to pay Rs. 600/- to four sweepers plus 10% service charge and the management has to supply the cleaning material. The substantial question is whether the name of Krishan Kumar is in the list of employees of M/s. Security Guards Corporation or not. Annexure III shows that Krishan Kumar's name has been entered at Sl. No. 3 on the said Security Guards Corporation for cleaning of NCC. It shows that Krishan Kumar was an employee of M/s. Security Guards Corporation. Annexure-IV shows that Krishan Kumar received payments from M/s. Security Guards Corporation. Even a single paper has not been filed by the workman that has received payment from the management. The payment to M/s. Security Guards Corporation has been made lump sum by the management. The employment form has been filled up under the Security Guards Corporation. This paper also indicates that the workman was a contractor's man and he was not an independent employee of the management. It establishes the fact that the payment was made to Krishan Kumar through Security Guards Corporation. His employment form was filled up through the said firm and his name is in the worker's of the M/s. Security Guards Corporation.

My attention was drawn to 1985 (50) FLR 20 and it was argued that it was a contract for services but this law is not applicable in the facts and circumstances of this case as it is explicit from the record that he was an employee of the M/s. Security Guards Corporation.

1978(37) FLR 136 SC is regarding the test of employer and employee relationship. The Hon'ble APEX Court has held that should be supervision and control of the management and payment should be made by the management but in this case, neither the payment has been made by the management to the workman nor there is any paper regarding the supervision of the management.

My attention was drawn to 1995 LLR 552. In it, it has been held that an industrial dispute can be raised for abolition of contract labour system but there is no such case in this dispute. As such, from the perusal of the record, it becomes obvious that Shri Krishan Kumar was an employee of M/s. Security Guards Corporation. He was not the employee of the management so he has got no right of reinstatement or regularisation.

The rulings cited by the workman are not applicable in the facts and circumstances of the case. The workman has not established that he was an employee of the RBI. The award is replied thus :—

Shri Krishan Kumar was not a workman of Reserve Bank of India. The action of the Reserve Bank of India in terminating the services of Shri Krishan Kumar w.e.f. 07-1-1991 was justified. The workman is not entitled to any relief as prayed for.

The award is given accordingly.

DT. 26-06-2004

R.N. RAI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1760.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 12 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नार्दन रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण लखनऊ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई. डी. 156/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 05-07-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 41012/89/2002-आई. आर. (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1760.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 156/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Lucknow now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Northern Railway and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-41012/89/2002-IR (B-D)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW

PRESENT

SHRIKANT SHUKLA

PRESIDING OFFICER

I.D. No. 156/2002

Ref. No. L-41012/89/2002-IR(B-1) dated : 26-9-2002

BETWEEN

Shri Deepak Kumar, S/o Late Sh. Shyam Dev,
C/o The Divisional Organization Secretary,
Uttar Railway Karamchhari Union,
283/63, Kha Garhi Kanaora (Premwati Nagar)
PO-Manak Nagar, Lucknow (UP)-226001.

AND

The Sr. Divisional Mechanical Engineer (Loco)
Northern Railway, DRM Office,
Hazratganj, Lucknow (UP)-226001.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide their order No. L-41012/89/2002-IR (B-I) dated: 26-9-2002 referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal cum Labour Court, Lucknow.

“क्या उत्तर रेलवे प्रबंधन द्वारा स्व. श्याम देव, सेवा निवृत्त फिटर मिस्त्री के पुत्र श्री दीपक कुमार को शारीरिक तौर पर अक्षमता के आधार पर पारिवारिक पेंशन नहीं दिया जाना न्यायोचित तथा न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं तो वह किस अनुतोष का अधिकारी है?”

Deepak Kumar has filed the statement of claim alleging therein that his father, Shyam Dev was employed in Northern Railway at the post of Fitter Mistry, who retired on 30-9-81. However, it is alleged that father of Deepak Kumar expired on 22-4-87. The workman has alleged that he is physically handicapped. He has further alleged that he moved an application for family pension, but no order was passed for family pension on the ground of disability. Therefore, he has requested from the Tribunal that he be allowed the family pension w.e.f. 22-4-87 along with interest and cost of litigation.

The opposite party has filed the written statement in which the retirement of the father of Deepak Kumar is not disputed, his death too is not disputed. The management's case is that the workman, Deepak Kumar furnished some papers in the office of Railway Administration in connection with pensionary benefits on the basis of physical disability. This has been alleged by the management that DRM Office, Northern Railway, Lucknow sent a letter on 17-9-99 for examining the percentage of disability of Shri Deepak Kumar. It is alleged that Shri Deepak Kumar is not entitled to any relief which is stated in the statement of claim. The management has pleaded in additional pleas that reference is not maintainable before this Tribunal because there is no 'Industrial Dispute' and the claimant cannot raise the dispute under the Industrial Dispute

Act. It is also alleged that claimant is not workman as defined under Section 2(s) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Shri Deepak Kumar does not come within the definition of workman so he is not entitled to raise dispute against Railway Administration and as such, the reference is bad in the eye of law. It is alleged that Shri Shyam Dev did submit his settlement paper but had not declared regarding the disability/physically handicapped condition of claimant in his declaration. It is also pointed out by the management that disability if any pertains to the claimant may be after the death of deceased ex-employee, Shyam Dev. It is submitted that the ex-employee Shyam Dev died on 22-4-87 after retirement and till death the employee had not submitted any relevant papers regarding to disability of his son Deepak Kumar. It is also submitted that the claimant has not disclosed his own income from any source and the income from any movable/immovable property, which pertains to claimant, and if there is no income absolute by any source the declaration may be given by the claimant in his claim statement.

The workman has filed the rejoinder. In the rejoinder has stated that he was fully dependent on his father and he has no source of income by which he can maintain himself.

The workman has filed following documentary evidence which are photo copies:—

1. Handicapped certificate of Chief Medical Officer dated 2-6-99.
2. Application on prescribed for family pension.
3. Government of India, Ministry of Railway (Railway Board) circular No. 87/AC-II/21/33 dated 5-5-95 addressed to all General Managers, Central Railway, Bombay VT & others regarding payment of pension to handicapped.
4. Government of India, Deptt. of Pension and Pensioner's Welfare Office Memorandum No. 1/21/91-P&W (E) (Pt.) dt. 15-1-1999.
5. Photo copy of letter of DRM Office, NR, Lucknow No. 720E/PenIIG dt. 17-9-99 regarding payment of family pension to Shri Deepak Kumar Yadav for medical examination.

Shri Deepak Kumar has filed affidavit along with application dated 3-12-2001, photo state copy of letter or corporater Lucknow Nagar Nigam, photo copy of handicapped certificate issued to Suman Tewari and PPO issued in respect to Suman Tiwari.

Besides above evidence Shri Deepak Kumar has examined himself.

On 8-9-2003 parties representing the opposite party has stated that only in the following cases family pension could be sanctioned:

1. Suffering from any disorder or disability of mind; or
2. Being physically crippled; or
3. Disable so as to render him or her unable to earn living even after attaining age of 25 year.

Workman too was present on 8-9-2003. I found that his left hand was not in working order on being asked he stated that his left part of the body is effected. He also stated that he was a victim of polio.

I observed that workman may fall in the IIIrd category mentioned above. It was advised to the opposite party to get the worker examined by Railway doctor, so that they may reach the correct conclusion. Opposite party's representative stated that letter to this effect was sent to the Railway doctor for their opinion in the year 1999 and they want to ascertain first what the doctors opined. In case that document is available they will produce. The opposite party was allowed to produce it and 23-9-2003 was fixed for hearing. Although on 8-9-2003 APO SA Naqvi and SC Gupta were also present for opposite party and they did not bother to comply the order therefore on 23-10-2003 DRM was asked to take disciplinary action against his representative and DRM was also requested to fix date, time and place for medical examination of the workman, Deepak Kumar in view of the disability and the next date was fixed 23-11-2003. 23-11-2003 being Sunday the case was taken upon the very next day i.e. 24-11-2003. The advocate for opposite party, Shri U.K. Bajpai filed application C-17 along with copy of letter addressed to Chief Medical Supdt. Northern Railway hospital wherein it was written that letter was sent to the Chief Medical Supdt. On 29-10-2003 but no reply was received from Chief Medical Supdt. Shri U.K. Bajpai accordingly requested for sometime to file the medical report. Railway advocate was allowed 10 days time but no medical certificate was filed on behalf of Railways. Railway failed to file the report even on 18-12-2003. It is note worthy that railway did not co-operate the court regarding filing of medical report. However, workmen himself filed the photocopy of report, C-20 wherein the Chief Medical Supdt. gave his finding as follows :

“The disability 80% as mentioned in Handicapped Certificate No. 581/99/216/99 due to post polio residual paralysis. Lt. Upper and lower limbs is verified (as a Board decision).”

When the certificate was produced the representative of the opposite party stated that some clarification have

been sought from Chief Medical Supdt. and the representative of the management sought time to file the report. The opposite party was allowed time and next date fixed was 28-1-2004. It is noteworthy that until today when I am dictating the award no clarification or report is filed by the management or any representative as yet. On 28-1-2004 Shri U.K. Bajpai the advocate for opposite party examined Shri Raman Kumar, APO, NR, Lucknow and closed his evidence. After the management closed the evidence, Shri Deepak Kumar was directed to furnish his income from entire sources (movable and immovable) on affidavit and he was directed to state whether he is able to earn his livelihood or not and was directed to produce the certificate of Revenue Officers to this effect and the next date was fixed 5-3-2004. Before the above said dated i.e. 5-3-2004, the representative of Deepak Kumar filed affidavit C-23, photo copy of income certificate, paper No. C-24 and original certificate paper No. A1-26.

Shri Deepak Kumar was further cross-examined by Shri U. K. Bajpai on 19-3-2004.

The railway was allowed to file affidavit in rebuttal, but no affidavit was filed.

The arguments were heard and it was observed that the workman has stated on oath that he applied for family pension in the year 1988, while the witness of the opposite party has stated that Deepak Kumar applied for family pension in the year 1999. The opposite party has not admitted the application filed by Deepak Kumar. Deepak Kumar has moved an application for summoning documents with certificate. Therefore, it was felt necessary to summon the settlement paper along with the declaration of Late Shyam Dev which was prepared on the matter of his retirement and application of Deepak Kumar on prescribed form complete with certificates from the opposite party. The opposite party with-held the application of Deepak Kumar, however, furnished the file of Shyam Dev, Fitter Mistry.

The learned counsel of the opposite party has argued that the paper are not available. However, it was admitted in the arguments that application was moved in 1999. He also argued that the worker could not move the application in 1988 as there was no pension scheme of family pension for handicapped in the year 1988. He has argued on the basis of Railway Service (Pension) Rules, 1993 that the provision for family pension for handicapped was introduced in the year 1993 only. Thus therefore no doubt that the applicant did not move the application in the year 1988. It is also admitted fact that up to 8-12-98 the brother of Deepak Kumar was receiving family pension till the age he completed the age of 25 years, as has come in the cross-examination in chief of the APO, Shri Raman Kumar Sharma. In the circumstances it appears that when

the family pension of his brother Dilip stopped on 8-12-1998 only then Deepak Kumar tried to pursue for his pension in year 1999.

The learned advocate for opposite party has argued that the claim petition is premature as the management has not taken any decision for family pension in handicapped category. Before analysing the other aspects of the fact it is essential to deal with the legal issue. Whether or not the reference is bad in eye of law as alleged in by the opposite party.

The learned counsel for opposite party has vehemently argued that Deepak Kumar is not worker of railway and therefore, his case does not fall in the category of industrial dispute and as such, the court is barred by jurisdiction for giving its findings on the issue referred to it.

Where the appropriate Government make some dispute to some Tribunal, Presumption lies that being an industrial dispute. The definition is given under section 2 (K) where not only workers' dispute is termed as industrial dispute but the dispute of any person, which is connected, with terms of employment is also an industrial dispute. Herein I find that the terms and conditions of the railway employees are governed by the Railway Service Pension Rules. The terms of employment of the father of Deepak Kumar if entitles him to receive the family pension, he is entitled to raise the industrial dispute and he is not getting family pension enough his father was in the employment of the Railway. Deepak Kumar is not bared from raising the dispute before the appropriate government and the appropriate Government has rightly referred the issue for adjudication to this Tribunal. I therefore, do not find any illegality in the reference. The argument raised by Shri U. K. Bajpai before, is not maintainable.

The workman has himself stated on oath that he is handicapped since his childhood. He has also stated that he is disabled by 80%. This fact that Shri Deepak Kumar is disable by 80% is admitted by Shri Raman Kumar Sharma, APO, NR, Lucknow in his cross-examination. Therefore, it is established that Deepak Kumar is disabled by 80%. Not a single question has been asked in cross-examination of Deepak Kumar that he is not disable since his childhood. Shri Raman Kumar Sharma, APO has also not uttered a single word that Deepak Kumar has subsequently attained the disability. It is also proved by the medical evidence that he was suffering from past polio residual paralysis. In the circumstances I

come to the conclusion that Deepak Kumar was handicapped since childhood and he is still suffering from past polio residual paralysis.

Shri Deepak Kumar has proved by affidavit that he has no means of livelihood. The certificate issued by the Revenue Officer has established that Shri Deepak Kumar Yadav earns by begging and that could not be considered to a lawful earning. From the evidence on record I am satisfied that Deepak Kumar is not in a position to earn his own livelihood due to past polio residual paralysis. I am also satisfied that he was dependent upon his father when he was alive and further was dependent upon his brother who was receiving family pension till 8-12-1998. This satisfaction is inferred from the facts stated by APO, Shri Raman Kumar Sharma in his cross-examination. In the circumstances I come to the conclusion that he is entitled to family pension. But at the same time it is also noteworthy that the management has stated in clear-cut language that the claimant is not entitled to any relief. This amounts to denial of Deepak Kumar's right to receive family pension. The issue referred therefore is answered in negative, against the management.

So far as the relief is concerned, the workman is not at all entitled to receive any family pension from 22-4-87, as he never demanded for it. Family Pension Scheme for Handicapped is stated to have been introduced in the year 1993 only and Shri Deepak Kumar applied in the year 1999. The date on which he applied is not clear.

The only document which gives specific date, month and year is annexure No. 5 to statement of claim which is paper No. 2/11. This letter is dated 17-9-99, which has been issued on the basis of application received from Deepak Kumar Yadav.

Therefore, in the fitness of case Shri Deepak Kumar is entitled for family pension as per Railway Family Pension Rules from 17-9-99. There is no order as to interest or litigation cost. The management is directed to pay the arrears of family pension within two months from the date of publication of award in the official gazette, in default the workman, Deepak Kumar shall be entitled to the compound interest @ 9% per annum. Award passed accordingly.

29-6-2004, Lucknow

SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

AWARD

का. आ. 1761.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई डी 192 ऑफ 1999) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 12012/199/99-आई. आर. (बी-1)]
अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1761.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 192 of 1999) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-12012/199/99-IR (B.I.)]
AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
CHANDIGARH**

Presiding Officer : Shri Kuldip Singh,

CASE NO. I.D. 192 OF 1999

Received on 12-10-1999

Decided on 16-6-2004

Ranjit Kumar son of Shri Amar Nath Resident of V.P.O.
Dheneta, District Hamirpur (H.P.) ... Applicant

Versus

1. The Deputy General Manager, State Bank of India, Zonal Office, Shimla.
2. The Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India, Region-I, Zonal Office, Shimla. H.P. ... Respondents.

APPEARANCES :—

For the Workman : Shri M.M. Putney
For the Management : Shri Ashok Khullar

Vide notification No. L-12012/199/99-IR(B-I) dated 24th of September 1999, the Central Govt. has referred the following matter of adjudication to this Tribunal-cum-Labour Court.

“Whether the action of Dy. General Manager, State Bank of India, Zonal Office, Shimla and Asstt. General Manager, State Bank of India, Region-I Shimla, in dismissing the services of Shri Ranjit Kumar son of Shri Amar Nath, Messenger w.e.f. 8-8-1996 is just and legal? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. After receipt of the notification, notices were served upon both the parties. The workman appeared on 2-2-2000, whereas the respondent appeared through A.C. Jaidka, law officer of the respondent on 15-3-2000. The workman filed the claim statement on the day he appeared to which the respondent filed written statement on 18-12-2000. Workman filed affidavit on 30-1-2001. In reply to that the respondent filed on affidavit on 30-4-2001. Thereafter the management opted to remain absent and so that court proceeded ex parte against them, but later on ex parte proceedings were set-aside on payment of costs and the case was restored to the stage of proceedings when ex parte order was passed against them.

3. The petitioner in his claim statement, submitted that he got his name registered with the employment exchange, being an unemployed and his name was recommended to the respondent bank for the post of messenger. He had appeared before the respondent and was selected for that post vide appointment order dated 28-1-1994; that neither the employment exchange nor respondent bank ever circulated or notified to the petitioner about the educational qualification required for the appointment of messenger. In compliance of the appointment letter he joined his duty on 2-2-1994 at Sansarpur Terrace Branch of the respondent bank in Himachal Pradesh where he submitted documents as required under rules that he discharged his duties to the best of abilities and his service record remained excellent although; that to his utter surprise he was served with the chargesheet on 11-2-1995, asking him to explain as to why he had not declared having a passed matriculation examination, at the time of his initial appointment, in the bank. In reply to that it was stated by him that to the best of knowledge of the petitioner he had not passed the matriculation examination till the date he submitted the documents. To his ill luck the explanation submitted by him was not accepted by the A.G.M. Shimla, the punishing authority and an enquiry was ordered against him. That the enquiry was only a cover, whereas the respondent bank had already decided to punish the workman for no fault of his. As such the enquiry officer did not afford full

opportunity to the workman to defend himself and acted in a mechanical manner in holding the enquiry. The petitioner was not provided with the requisite documents, information and that prejudiced the case of the petitioner. Enquiry Officer did not record the findings as to when, the petitioner was informed about the educational and other criteria for the appointment of the messenger, so as to hold him guilty and so as to award him the punishment of dismissal, through order dated 7-6-1996. The petitioner has further alleged that his appeal was also not considered judiciously and was rejected in a casual and routine manner. He has alleged that the action of the respondent bank in dismissing the petitioner from the service is illegal, ultra-vires, unconstitutional and bad in law on the ground that without any evidence, about the notice of educational eligibility criteria to the petitioner no charge sheet could be served upon him and nor he could be held guilty for the same. Moreover the petitioner had submitted the information about his educational qualification as was known to him and also the over qualification could not be a disqualification for appointment as a messenger. Mentioning the names of those who are matriculate and are working as messengers, the petitioner has claimed that his being a matriculate could not be a disqualification since the criteria, fixed by the bank, did not prohibit him from applying for the job, on the ground that he possessed better qualification than the one prescribed.

4. Coming to the punishment awarded, it is claimed by the petitioner that the same is disproportionate to the guilt alleged against the petitioner. That the fixing of the criteria for the post of messenger was violative of Article 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India. That the enquiry conducted by the bank was not proper since no opportunity was given to the petitioner. No opportunity was given even by the punishing authority. Even the appellate authority failed to examine the case of the petitioner judiciously and as such the termination of the petitioner is bad in law, therefore, the same be set-aside.

5. The respondents have opposed the claim of the petitioner by filing their written statement by which they have admitted that the petitioner was sponsored by the employment exchange Dharmshala, but denied that respondents had not been informed. By the concerned employment exchange, about the criteria, fixed for the recommendations to the post of messenger. In fact vide its letter dated 28-12-1992 the employment exchange was informed that the educational qualification, required for the post of messenger, was minimum 8th class standard, as per the State Bank of India Regulations. Besides the bank has Circular No. PER/56 OF 1988 dated 11-4-1988 wherein it is mentioned that the educational qualification, for the post of messenger in the bank shall be 8th class pass and not 10th class pass. The respondent further allege that the workman, on his selection on the post of messenger, did not declare correctly his educational qualification and

in the attestation from he has mentioned having passed middle standard examination. They denied the contents of para 5 of the claim statement, but admitted that the petitioner had joined his duty on 2-2-1994 at Sansarpur, Terrace Branch. It is contended by the bank, that the petitioner was charge sheeted, since he had obtained the job by suppressing the facts and thereby committed misconduct. Disputing the claim of the petitioner, that he had no communication with his family, after he appeared in the matriculation examination, till he was appointed on the job, contended that such a claim cannot be accepted especially when the petitioner was unemployed and was searching for the job. Supporting the decision of the disciplinary authority, it is submitted by the respondents that it was a right decision; that the enquiry was fairly conducted, in which, the petitioner was given full opportunity to defend himself. That the learned disciplinary authority as well as Appellate Authority, judiciously considered the case of the petitioner. Denying the allegations that the relevant documents were not supplied to the workman, the respondent have claimed that all the relevant documents were provided to the petitioner, during the course of enquiry. But the petitioner was found guilty in the enquiry and therefore, he was held to have suppressed the information about his educational qualification and thereby grossly misconducted himself and he deserved the punishment. Punishing authority, on the basis of having found him guilty, dismissed him from service. Denying the averments, made by the petitioner in other paras of statement of claim, it is submitted by the respondents that the petitioner was rightly dismissed from service, after hearing him and proper enquiry. The punishment awarded was proportionate to the guilt of the petitioner; and that the reference made in the case must be dismissed.

6. The record of the file shows that after filing the pleading by the parties, the Court asked the respondent first to file the complete enquiry file and they were asked to argue on the fairness of the enquiry. However, the respondent, instead of producing the enquiry file, placed on record photo copies of the proceedings, the correctness of which has not been challenged by the petitioner, either in writing or during the course of arguments. It is true that the parties did not produce anything orally or by way of affidavits and other documents, argued on the whole of the case. At no stage, either in their pleadings or during the arguments, they claim that in case the fairness of the enquiry is not proved, they may be allowed to produce evidence to show that the action of the respondent, dismissing the petitioner from service, was or was not bad in law. From this it is clear that the documents placed on record are not disputed by them and so they want the case to be decided in view of the facts and law.

7. From the pleadings of the parties and the submissions made by them, the admitted case of the

parties is that the petitioner obtained the employment as messenger with the respondent bank, by showing his qualification as 8th standard pass and did not disclose that he was a matriculate, on the date, he applied for the job as well as on the day he joined his service on 2-2-1994. On the record I find a letter from the Assistant Secretary (Exams.) H.P. Board of School Education Dharamshala which reads that Ranjit Kumar son of Amar Nath, admittedly the petitioner, had appeared in the matriculation examination in March, 1986 under roll number 120430, as a regular candidate, from Govt. High School Dhaneta, district Hamirpur and he was declared successful having scored 450 marks; and that the date of birth of the petitioner was 07-04-1971. Against this document, the petitioner has placed nothing on record. He has only tried to show, by a letter dated 21-4-1995, address to the A.G.M. of the respondent bank Shimla, whereby he has tried to show that he had appeared in the 10th class examination, but he had no hope of getting through it and thereafter he left the house; and that when he applied for the job, in the bank, he was having only this information that he is middle pass; and that he had come to know about his having passed matriculation examination during the proceedings, initiated against him, by the bank. This submission of the workman is not supported by any evidence, placed on record and therefore, can not be accepted even at this stage. The sum and substance of the stand taken by the respondent is that the petitioner had procured the employment in the bank by resorting to deceitful means; and that *prima-facie* he is guilty of suppression of material facts. He was also guilty of misleading the concerned authorities in order to seek employment and therefore, he has grossly misconducted himself.

8. In a case, before the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, being C.W.P. No. 348 of 1997, decided on 25th of November, 1999, a similar situation came before Their Lordships of the Division Bench. In that case also the petitioner had obtained the employment by showing his educational qualification wrongly as having passed only 8th standard examination. He did not disclose that he was a matriculate having passed the said examination in the year 1988. He further withheld the information that, before applying for the job, with the respondent, in another branch of the State Bank of India, he had worked as voluntary teacher in the Education Department of Himachal Pradesh in the year 1992. Thus it was proved that the petitioner had withheld the factum of his possessing higher qualification. The Hon'ble High Court after considering the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case reported as Y. Srinivasa Rao Vs. J. Veeraiah and Others AIR 1993 S.C. has held, that the petitioner did not commit any misconduct, by not disclosing his higher qualification. They referred to Rule 29 which pertained to the eligibility criteria, which is similar in the present case.

Education qualification required for the post of a messenger-cum-farash was under matric (minimum 8th standard for the post of messenger), however ex-servicemen for the post of messenger-cum-guard were required not to possess such minimum qualification. They held, that thus the rule, as in the present case, and the circular, much relied upon by the respondent, bearing No. PER-56/98 did contain, the stipulation about the minimum qualification. The use of the word "minimum", according to Their Lordships, postulate that neither it was meant to be the only qualification nor that any ceiling, on the possession of education qualification, over and above, that envisaged in the circular was ever in the contemplation of the circular, issuing authority or any such restriction incorporated in the said circular. Thus in the absence of any positive and specific stipulation in the circular which could preclude the applicant from possessing educational qualification, over and above the minimum educational qualification, for making an application to the post in question, according to Their Lordships, disentitled the bank, either to consider to him for the appointment or get him appointed, they were of the view that it is beyond comprehension as to how the respondent read, into the circular, such restrictions so as to render the petitioner in a eligible person, who possessed educational qualification over and above the one prescribed as the minimum, in the circular. Since clearly the respondent bank has failed to point out or bring to my notice anything to show that the petitioner has committed serious lapse or misconducted so as to be a subject of departmental disciplinary proceedings and findings to loose the job he had been given.

9. Coming to the question of alleged suppression of actual facts, Their Lordships of the H.P. High Court has held, that actual educational qualification of the petitioner was that he was a matriculate as on the date of his application as also on the date of his appointment and the omission to specify the same and the act of the petitioner in disclosing that he is only 9th standard pass, in a particular year and not constitute a suppression of a vital or a relevant fact, which he was otherwise obliged to disclose and which he failed to have disclosed or withheld deliberately to expose him to the charge of suppression, in a departmental proceedings. The words 'suppression' as defined in Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition if Their Lordship's view, meant, conscious effort to control and conceal unacceptable impulses thoughts, feelings or acts. The concealment of truth and/or expression of what is false, is always, they held, meant to constitute suppression. Suppression or concealment invariably is indicative of an element of fraud also in it and to suppress anything to put a stop to it when it actually exists and at times and not to constitute suppression by merely preventing or withholding that which may lead to the actual factum of suppression.

It may be noted here that the counsel for the respondent laid much stress on the circular No. PER 56/98 and argued that the said circular contains a specific stipulation about the qualification required for appointment as messenger. I have gone through the circular and this circular does not contain more than what is contained in Rule 29, referred to above, and the said rule was examined by Their Lordships of the H.P. High Court, in the judgment (supra) and have held as noted above. Moreover there is nothing on the record to show that either in the advertisement notice, issued by the respondent bank or the employment exchange, Dharamshala, ever notified to the candidates including the petitioner that those having qualification over an above than the prescribed, were barred from applying for the post. In the absence of any such notice, how the petitioner would be held guilty for possessing over an above qualification to that which was required for applying for the post. Counsel for the respondent has referred to the judgment of High Court of Andhra Pradesh passed in Writ Petition No. 13127 of 1988, a photocopy of which is on record, but the date of decision of which is not available in the photocopy. Taking support of this judgment he submitted that the case of the petitioner falls squarely, in the facts of the case, on the case, which was before Their Lordships of the A.P. High Court. I have gone through this judgment, but in my views, it is not helpful to the respondent because the matter before Their Lordships of the A.P. High Court was on different points. There is no dispute that it is for the employer to prescribe the qualifications for a particular job and it is the employer who can declare any qualification as a disqualification. Their Lordships, therefore, held that the decision of the management that acquisition of higher qualification was a bar for recruitment, could not be violative of Article 14, 16 of the constitution of India. In the present case no such bar was ever put on the recruitment of petitioner.

10. As regards the question of action of the management in prescribing that acquisition of higher qualification is a bar for the recruitment of the post, Their Lordships followed the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case reported as AIR 1993 S.C. 929 (supra) and held that where over qualification is not prescribed as a bar for consideration of appointment, any rejection on the ground of possession of over qualification, amounted to arbitrariness and therefore, violative of Article 14 & 16 of the Constitution. In the case before the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh, the regulation had prescribed that for the post of messenger/watchman/armed guard one should have passed 8th class but not 10th class to seek appointment to those posts. The petitioner in that case had passed S.S.C. examination even at the time of his initial appointment as temporary messenger, but in view of the regulation he was not

absorbed permanently and the Hon'ble High Court upheld the decision of the respondent bank saying that when the regulation clearly prescribed maximum qualification for the recruitment of such posts, the action of the respondent bank was justified and the writ petition was dismissed. In the present case no maximum qualification had been prescribed by the circular, relied upon by the respondent; and following the judgment of the H.P. High Court, it is held that the over qualification of the petitioner was no bar for holding the appointment, given to him, by the respondent.

11. I have also considered the question of the fairness of the enquiry, claimed by the respondent. The petitioner has failed to bring to my notice anything to show that by any action of the respondent, the authorities who held the enquiry, the punishing authority or the appellate authority misconducted in appreciating the case of the petitioner. No doubt the authorities laboured under a wrong conception, that the circular which they considered contained eligibility criteria, about the recruitment of the messenger contained the stipulation of maximum qualification, required as a messenger. To my mind it only laid minimum qualification i.e. under matric or to the least middle pass. There could not be limit over and above qualification required for appointment as messenger.

12. It has already been discussed above that in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh (supra), the petitioner did not suppress the facts as is claimed by the respondent. Since suppression or concealment invariably has indication of an element of fraud in it and to suppress anything is to put a stop to it when it actually exists and at times it may not constitute suppression by merely preventing or with-holding that which may lead to the actual factum of suppression. Supposing but not accepting that the petitioner suppressed the facts by concealing that he was a matriculate at time of applying for the post, yet, the conduct of the petitioner could not be said to be fraudulent for the reasons that by saying that he is a middle pass, he did not say that he has not studied after that. Moreover the punishment awarded to the petitioner was not proportionate to the act/lapse alleged to have been committed by him. I have already discussed that the circular (supra) relied upon by the respondent did not provide, under the eligibility criteria, the maximum qualification, a candidate was to possess before applying for the job. As per the circular the qualification prescribed was the minimum which was shown to be under matric and to the least middle pass. The punishing authority did not take this matter into consideration in the right prospective and awarded the maximum punishment i.e. dismissal from service. This in my opinion was disproportionate to the lapse committed by the petitioner. There is no evidence on the record to show that during the service of one year

the conduct of the petitioner was such so as to invite such a harsh punishment. On that ground also the action of the punishing authority and then the appellate authority can not be approved. This also leads me to the conclusions I have arrived at hereinafter in the case.

In view of the discussion made above, the reference is answered in the following terms :

The action of the Deputy General Manager SBI Zonal Office, Shimla and AGM, SBI, Region. I Shimla in dismissing the services of Ranjit Kumar son of Amar Nath, messenger w.e.f. 8-8-96 was unjust and illegal. He is treated to be on duty right from that date as it there was no order of his dismissing from service. As regards other relief, the petitioner is entitled to, I find nothing in the pleading of the petitioner as well as of the respondent, to show that during this period the petitioner was or was not gainfully engaged in any pursuit so as to claim back wages. Therefore, in my opinion, he is not entitled to any backwages. However, he shall be entitled to other benefits in service such as seniority in service and consequential benefits if any, which he would have got except for his dismissal from service.

Chandigarh

Dated 16-6-2004

KULDIP SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1762.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ईस्टर्न रेलवे, धनबाद के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. II, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई डी - 67 आफ 1995) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल.-41012/32/94-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O. 1762.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 67 of 1995) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. II, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Eastern Railway, Dhanbad and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-41012/32/94-IR (B.I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas,

Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 67 OF 1995

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of Eastern Railway, Dhanbad and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : Mr. B. B. Prasad, Advocate.

On behalf of the employers : None

State : Jharkhand.

Industry : Railway.

Dhanbad, Dated, the 18th June, 2004.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10 (1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-41012/32/94-IR (B), dated the 5th May, 1995 :—

SCHEDULE

" Whether the action of the E. Rly, Dhanbad management in removing from service of Shri Indradeo Prasad, Ex-TXR w.e.f. 10th Sept., 1985 is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?"

2. The case of the concerned workman, according to Written Statement submitted by him in brief is as follows :—

He submitted that while he was posted as Train Examiner at Katrasgarh he was in possession of Qr. No. 44/A at Katrasgarh. As the said quarter was absolutely insufficient to meet his requirement he submitted representation before the appropriate authority for allotment of type II quarter since 1973. He submitted that Mr. R.N. Sharma No. I was in possession of type II Quarter No. 38/C. As he was due to be retired from his service w.e.f. 31-1-85 he submitted representation to the management for allotment of the said quarter in his favour and for that purpose he met Sr. D.M.E. (C&W)/DHN on

21-2-85. After hearing him said Sr. D.M. made his endorsement on his application for allotment of type II quarter in his favour at Katrasgarh and further verabably ordered him to get possession of the said quarter which will be adjusted in his favour in future. In good faith he took possession of the said quarter. He alleged that management putting ante date allotted the said quarter in the name of R.N. Sharma II. He submitted that over the said issue management issued chargesheet to him with the allegation of committing misconduct. Again with the allegation of dispossession of R.N. Sharma II on 29-3-85 an F.I.R. was also lodged against him. He alleged that management with the issuance of chargesheet suspended him from service.

He submitted that prior to taking possession of type II Qr. No. 38-C in the year 1981 one Type II Q.r. No. 34-A was allotted to him but he could not get possession of the same as it was not vacated by its occupant. Again on 2-12-83 another type II Qr. No. 143/B was allotted to him and inspite of confirmation of that order of allotment on 19-12-83 he could not get possession of the same as by that time it was allotted to Shamsul Haque Fitter. He categorically denied the fact that he occupied quarter No. 38/C on 29-9-85 unauthorisedly dispossessing R.N. Sharma II therefrom. He further submitted that as per Indian Railway Establishment manual such occupation of the quarter even unauthorisedly does not amount commission of any misconduct which could invite issuance of chargesheet. He disclosed that even if it is considered that he was in unauthorised occupation of that quarter in that case management had the scope to give him time to vacate the same and to realise penal rent from him but without taking that step he was chargesheeted and suspended from his service and thereafter appointed enquiry officer to hold domestic enquiry against him. He disclosed that before taking up hearing of the Enquiry proceeding he made an appeal to the Enquiry Officer to stay further hearing till finalisation of the appeal which he preferred, in view of direction given by the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta in disposing of the Writ Petition filed by him but his appeal did not yield any result. On the contrary enquiry officer conducted domestic enquiry ex parte against him and submitted his report holding him guilty to the charges and relying on that report Sr. D.M.E. (C&W) DHN. dismissed him from service by issuing an order dt. 10-9-85. He submitted that said Dr. D.M.R. was not his appointing authority and for which order of dismissal issued by him under his signature is liable to be vitiated as he was not competent person to dismiss. He further alleged that management neither supplied copies of enquiry papers including report, nor issued any notice to him before passing the order of dismissal. He further alleged that Enquiry Officer conducted the Enquiry proceedings illegally, arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice.

Accordingly, he submitted his prayer to pass award directing the management to reinstate him in service with full back wages and consequential relief.

3. The management on the contrary after filing written statement have denied all the claims and allegation which the concerned workman asserted in the his written statement.

They submitted that the instant reference is not maintainable in the eye of law as the concerned workman suppressing the material facts before the Central Govt. arranged for referring the present dispute for adjudication before this Tribunal. They disclosed that before raising the instant dispute, the concerned workman over the self same issue raised dispute before the Central Administrative Tribunal Patna which was registered as Case No. OA-310/87 and the said application was dismissed by the said Tribunal vide order dt. 22-6-98. They submitted that in the said decision Hon'ble Tribunal in Para 75 of the judgement observed categorically that the concerned workman was guilty of serious misconduct for breaking the lock and forcibly taking possession of the Rly. quarters allotted in favour of one R.N. Sharma. They further submitted that the Hon'ble Tribunal in disposing of that case considered the legality and validity of chargesheet issued against the concerned workman and upheld the order of the dismissal passed against him by the Disciplinary Authority. Accordingly the matter has been set at rest and cannot be reopened. They pointed out that the judgement of the CAT dt. 22-6-88 has exposed correct picture about committing misconduct by the workman and the consequences ensued therefrom.

They disclosed that the concerned workman was dismissed from his service by the employee after holding free and fair department mental enquiry after issuance of chargesheet to him for committing serious misconduct. In course of said departmental enquiry all reasonable opportunities were given to him but he failed to avail the same.

They disclosed that the concerned workman preferred Writ petition before Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta challenging the order of suspension issued against him but he failed to get his desired result. After his dismissal from service he again raised dispute before the Hon'ble CAT Patna for his relief but there too his case was dismissed.

In view of the facts and circumstances stated above management submitted prayer to pass award rejecting the claim of the concerned workman.

4. POINTS TO BE DECIDED

"Whether the action of the R. Rly, Dhanbad management in removing from service of Shri Indradeo Prasad, Ex-TXR w.e.f. 10th Sept., 1985 is

justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

5. FINDING WITH REASONS

It transpires from the record that the concerned workman with a view to substantiate his claim examined himself as WW-1. The management on the contrary did not adduce any evidence in support of their claim. Now let me consider how far the claim of the concerned workman stands on cogent footing. The concerned workman during his evidence not only raised dispute against the order of dismissal issued under signature of Sr. D.M.E. (C&W) Dhanbad who was not his appointing authority but also challenged the legality and validity of chargesheet issued to him for committing alleged misconduct and the way the management conducted departmental enquiry against him. He disclosed that C.M.E. Calcutta was his appointing authority and for which Sr. D.M.E. had no jurisdiction to issue order of dismissal against him.

Considering the facts disclosed in the written statement submitted by the concerned workman and also considering his evidence I find no dispute to hold that management issued chargesheet to him for unauthorised occupation of Rly. quarter No. 38-C which actually was allotted in the name of R. N. Sharma II. This witness disclosed that though he took possession of the said quarter vacated the same on 18-3-85 and communicated the same in writing to the management but inspite of the said fact management not only suspended him from service with effect from 30-3-85 but also started departmental enquiry against him. He further alleged that said R. N. Sharma II, also lodged FIR against him relying on which Police started a Criminal case against him. He disclosed that ultimately he was acquitted from the said Criminal case by Ld. Additional District and Sessions Judge, 5th Court, Dhanbad indisposing of criminal appeal No. 153/88. Certified copy of the said judgement during his evidence was marked as Ext. W-4. I have considered the judgement and I find support of the claim of the concerned workman.

This witness disclosed that against the said order of dismissal he preferred a Writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta and as per order of the Hon'ble Court he submitted an appeal before C.M.E. Calcutta through proper channel. He also intimated the said fact to the disciplinary authority but the enquiry officer did not take cognizance of the same and completed departmental enquiry against him exparte and submitted his report. He alleged that relying on the report of exparte hearing of the Departmental enquiry the Disciplinary authority dismissed him from his service w.e.f. 10-9-85 illegally arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice.

During cross-examination WW-1 i.e. the concerned workman admitted that over the self same issue he filed a

case before CAT, Patna and the said case was registered as CA/310/87. He admitted that the said case was dismissed in the year 1987 and against that order he preferred SLP before the Hon'ble Apex Court but disclosed that he is not aware about the fate of that SLP. He admitted that thereafter over the self same cause of action he has raised the present industrial dispute for his relief. Inspite of admitting this fact he disclosed that the facts which he disclosed in the written statement submitted before the CAT and the facts of the Written statement in the instant case are not same.

It is seen that in course of hearing the concerned workman did not consider necessary to submit the written statement which he filed before the CAT.

However, considering the present written statement it transpires that over unauthorised occupation of RLY Quarter which was allotted in the name of another workman management issued chargesheet to him and consequent to that chargesheet they decided to hold departmental enquiry against him. A criminal case over the self same allegation was lodged against him. However, subsequently he was acquitted from that case by the Appellate Court, which I have already discussed above. It is admitted fact that the said departmental enquiry was held exparte against the concerned workman as he did not appear. On the contrary from the submission of the concerned workman i.e. WW-1 it transpires that he preferred Writ petition against the chargesheet issued to him by the management before the Hon'ble High Court, Calcutta and hearing of that Writ petition was pending when departmental enquiry started against him. He disclosed that enquiry officer did not defer hearing of the departmental enquiry inspite of giving intimation to him in the matter of pendency of hearing of that Writ petition. He disclosed that thereafter on the basis of report of the departmental enquiry he was dismissed from his service with effect from 10-9-85.

From the copy of the judgement passed by the Ld. Judge Central Administrative Tribunal it transpires that the case which was initiated by the concerned workman was in the year 1987 being No. OA-310/87. Therefore it is clear that after the order of dismissal issued by the management against the concerned workman from his service he filed that case. From the judgement in question it transpires clearly that the concerned workman filed that application with a prayer for quashing the order of removal dt. 10-9-85 passed by the D.M.E. (C&W) Eastern Rly., Dhanbad. He also claimed quashing order dt. 21-4-87 and 30-7-87 passed by the Senior Personnel Officer, Dhanbad.

In the instant case the concerned workman submitted his prayer for his reinstatement in service with effect from the date of his removal from service i.e. 10-9-85 declaring that the said order passed by the management was illegal, arbitrary, unjustified and mala fide. Therefore it

is clear that the issue taken in the instant case for disposal and the issue taken before the CAT are same. I have carefully considered the judgement passed by the Ld. Judge of the CAT in connection with Case No. OA-310/87. It transpires that after elaborate discussion Ld. Judge, dismissed the case of the concerned workman as he was not convinced with the argument extended by his Ld. Advocate. Against that judgement, concerned workman preferred S.L.P. before the Hon'ble Apex Court. It is the contention of the concerned workman that till date he is not aware of the fate of the S.L.P. which was filed before the Hon'ble Apex Court. This contention of the concerned workman is very hard to accept. on the ground that being an interested party he preferred S.L.P. with a view to get his relief.

However, considering the facts and circumstances it is clear that he choose two forum to get his relief, over the self same issue. As he failed to get his relief before the first forum i.e. CAT and also as he did not get any relief from the Hon'ble Apex Court preferring S.L.P. he preferred the second forum i.e. this Tribunal for getting his relief raising Industrial dispute. There is sufficient reason to believe considering conduct of the concerned workman that he suppressing the fact before the Central Govt. practically obtained the order of reference for its adjudication before this Tribunal. A person cannot seek for relief from two independent forum over same cause of action as it is to be considered bad in law.

Accordingly I hold that the instant case is not maintainable in the eye of law and for which he is not entitled to get relief in view of his prayer.

In the result, the following award is rendered :

"The action of the Eastern Railway, Dhanbad management in removing from service of Shri Indradeo Prasad, Ex-TXR w.e.f. 10th Sept., 1985 is justified. Consequently he is not entitled to get any relief."

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1763.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नार्दन रेलवे, के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण लखनऊ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई डी-179/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 41012/123/2000-आई. आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 6th July, 2004

S.O.1763.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (ID No. 179 of 2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Lucknow now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Northern Railway, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-41012/123/2000-IR (B-1)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT LUCKNOW

PRESENT:

Shrikant Shukla : Presiding Officer

I.D. No. 179/2000

Ref. No. 41012/123/2000-IR (B-1) dated : 3/7-11-2000

BETWEEN

Shri Shyam Lal
S/o Sh. Shiv Prasad
By Shri D.K. Jha, T-46, B,
G.T. Road, Kanpur (U.P.)-4.

AND

The Divisional Railway Manager
Northern Railway,
Allahabad (U.P.)-211006.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide their order No. 41012/123/2000-IR (B.1) dated 3/7-11-2000 referred the following dispute for adjudication to the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow.

"Whether the action of the management of Divisional Railway Manager, Northern Railway, Allahabad in removal from the services of Shri Shyam Lal, helper K, vide order dated 16-2-1999 is legal and justified? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

Shri Shyam Lal has filed the statement of claim alleging that he was permanently employed as helper

khalasi under Senior Divisional Engineer (Carriage & Wagon), NR, Shikohabad under the supervision of Asstt. Electrical Engineer (Carriage & Wagon), NR, Tundla. It is further alleged that the opposite party vide their order dated 16-2-99 terminated his services. It is further alleged that he was charged vide charge sheet No. RS/805/Kanpur/96 dated 28-10-96 by Asstt. Electrical Engineer (Carriage & Wagon), NR, Allahabad. The workman alleged that he was detained on work at Kanpur on the date of occurrence. He was charged for assault and misbehaviour. A report to this effect was also lodged at GRP, Kanpur. The workman has alleged that he was not provided the copy of documents during the departmental proceedings and Sr. Divisional Engineer (Carriage & Wagon), NR, Tundla was appointed as Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer completed the enquiry proceedings with jelouse motive and submitted his report to the Disciplinary Authority on 30-9-98 and the Disciplinary Authority without applying its mind passed the order of removal dated 16-2-99, which was delivered to the workman on 25-2-99. The workman preferred a appeal on 22-3-99, which was rejected on 22-4-99. The workman has alleged that enquiry proceedings were conducted in the violation of principles of natural justice and contrary to rules and the workman was not provided the opportunity to defend himself and, therefore, the punishment order dated 16-2-99 is liable to set aside and he is liable to be reinstated to all back wages and consequential benefits.

The opposite party has filed the written statement denying the allegations of the workman. The management has stated that the workman was given full opportunity during the course of enquiry and the enquiry was conducted according to the principles of natural justice. It is also allege that the workman was given full opportunity to defend himself. The management has also stated that the workman during the course of employment used to often create nuisance and never respected his superiors and never obeyed them. It is further stated that the workman was habitual absentee and had no interest in work at all. This caused loss to the administration. He often assaulted officers/supervisors of railway under whom he worked. Not only this the workman was often seen drunk, abusing the railway administration, creating a terror among employees of the depot on duty in railway premises. Prior to the award of punishment of removal from service the workman was awarded minor punishment, warnings for his misbehaviour, misconduct, assault with superiors but workman did not mend his ways. As a consequence of the assault committed by the applicant an FIR was lodged earlier and during the course of enquiry the workman had again committed an assault on his superiors as such the matter has been reported to higher authorities depot (C&W) supervisors (CNB) and FIR

was lodged against the workman. The workman violated the conduct rules on duty in the railway premises several times by misbehaving and assaulting railway officials and even at one time workman was sent to the jail also during enquiry proceedings. Disciplinary Authority as per Discipline and Appeal Rules 196 removed the workman from service vide its order dated 16-2-99 as the authorities found the charges against the workman to have been proved as such, proper action was taken by railways and removal order dated 16-2-99 is legal and valid and justified and in conformity with the provisions of law. It is alleged by the management that finding no merit in the appeal the Appellate Authority dismissed the appeal. The management has therefore, prayed that the statement of claim is liable to be dismissed.

On 4-2-2002 following preliminary issues were framed:

1. Whether the domestic enquiry was fair and proper ? And
2. Whether the finding of domestic enquiry suffers with the vice of perversity ?

Both the issues were decided against the workman vide order dated 18-7-2003.

After disposal of the aforesaid issue the workman appeared on 18-12-2003 and the next dated for evidence was fixed on 24-1-2003. The workman absented on 24-12-2003, 6-4-2004 and 21-4-2004 therefore, there was no option but to proceed under Rule 10 B (9) Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1947, ex-parte and the management was direct to produce its evidence.

The management has examined Praveen Sharma. The management has proved that the Disciplinary Authority issued show cause notice on 28-8-98 and the workman received the notice on 9-11-98 but the workman did not sent any reply and therefore, the Disciplinary Authority passed the order of removal from service on 16-2-99. Removal order was delivered to workman on 25-2-99. It is also proved that the workman preferred an appeal on 26-3-99 which was rejected on 22-4-99. The copy of which was received by workman on 11-6-99. The management has also proved that minor punishment, WIT for two years has been imposed on the workman for unauthorised absence, this punishment was awarded on the workman on 21-1-99. The management has also proved that the workman misbehaved and assaulted to supervisors and therefore, an FIR was registered at GRP, Kanpur which is pending. It is also proved that another FIR for misbehaviour and assault was registered on 3-10-98 while a supervisor was on duty at Farukhabad. Over and above the management has proved that Shyam Lal was in jail from 3-10-98 to 7-10-98.

Management has also proved by ex-parte evidence that Shyam Lal was not taking interest in his work and he was also indulged in misbehaving with railway employees besides unauthorised absence.

The workman has not come forward to disprove the charges and the workman has also not proved that the Appellate Authority has not applied its mind while rejecting his appeal with the result I come to the conclusion that the management in removing the workman vide order dated 16-2-99 is legal and justified. Issue referred, therefore, is answered in affirmative, against the workman. I also come to the conclusion that workman is not entitled to any relief.

Lucknow,

29-6-2004

SHRIKANT SHUKLA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1764.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. को. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II, के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 273/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/316/2001-आई. आर (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1764.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 273/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, II, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-20012/316/2001-IR(C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO.2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT: Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

REFERENCE NO. 273 OF 2001

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of M/s BCCL and their workman

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : None

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 2nd June, 2004

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/316/2001-IR(C-I), dated, the 24th September, 2001.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the union to regularise Sri Muslim Main as Dozer Operator is proper and justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled and from what date?"

2. Neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared in this case. None also appeared on behalf of the management. It reveals from the record that the instant reference case is pending since 2001 for disposal. It further transpires from the record that sufficient opportunities were given to the parties but in spite of giving ample opportunities they have fail to turn up and even they did not consider necessary to submit Written Statement on their behalf. Gesture of the parties if is taken into consideration it will expose clearly that the parties are not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances it is needless to adjourn the case *suo moto* for days together. Accordingly, a 'No Dispute' Award is rendered and the instant reference is disposed of on the basis of 'No dispute' Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का० आ० 1765.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 57/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-04 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/72/2002-आई० आर० (सी-1)]

एन० पी० केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1765.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 57/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-04.

[No. L-20012/72/2002-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 57 OF 2002

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of
Lodna Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCE:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. D. K. Verma,
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad the 3rd June, 2004.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to

this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/72/2002-IR (C-I), dated, the Nil.

SCHEDULE

“Whether management of BCCL Bagdigi Colliery's is justified in dismissing Sri Ram Chander Pasi from service? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. Management side however made appearance through their learned Advocates. It reveals from the record that the instant reference case is pending since 2002 for disposal. It further transpires from the record sufficient opportunities were given to the workman/union but in spite of giving ample opportunities the workman/union has failed to turn up before this Tribunal and even they did not consider necessary to submit Written Statement on their behalf. Geture of the workman/Union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that the workman/union is not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances it is needless to adjourn the case *suo moto* for days together. Accordingly, a 'No dispute' Award is rendered and the instant reference is disposed of on the basis of 'No dispute' Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का० आ० 1766.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीएमपीडीआईएल के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 303/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-04 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-20012/450/2001-आई० आर० (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1766.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 303/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of CMPDIL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-04.

[No. L-20012/450/2001-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE
BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 303 OF 2001

PARTIES :—Employers in relation to the management of C. M. P. D. I. L. and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : None
On behalf of the employers : Mr. B. P. Singh,
Personnel Manager.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal.

Dated the 3rd June, 2004.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/450/2001 dated 29-11-2001.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Central Mine Planning and Design Institute Limited, Ranchi in changing the weekly rest day from Sunday to other days in respect of Security Guards working in Ranchi and other camps including C.M.P.D.I.L. Headquarter, except Bhubaneshwar Region, is proper and justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared. Management side, however made appearance through their authorised representative. It reveals from the record that the instant reference case is pending since 2001 for disposal. It further transpires from the record that sufficient opportunities were given to the workman but in spite of giving ample opportunities the workman/union has failed to turn up and even they did not consider necessary to submit Written Statement on their behalf. Gesture of the workman/union if it taken into consideration will expose clearly that the workman/union is not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances it is needless to adjourn the case *suo moto* for days together. Accordingly, a ‘No dispute’ Award is rendered and the

instant reference is disposed of on the basis of ‘No dispute’ Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1767.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 115/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-04 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/222/98-आई.आर.(सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1767.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 115/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-04.

[No. L-20012/222/98-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT
DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 115 OF 1999

PARTIES :—Employers in relation to the management of Kusunda Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workman : None
On behalf of the employers : Mr. H. Nath,
Advocate
State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad the 2nd June, 2004

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/222/98 I.R. (C. I.) dated 29th January, 1999.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Kusunda Area of BCCL in not providing employment to Sri Dunarayan Kahar dependent son of Late Ramjee Ram, Ex-General Mazdoor, Kusunda Colliery who died while in service, although Sri Dunarayan Kahar had applied on 2-3-90 is justified? If not, what relief the dependent Sri Dunarayan Kahar is entitled?"

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared. However, management appeared through their learned Advocate. It reveals from the record that the instant reference case is pending since 1999 for disposal. It further transpires from the record that sufficient opportunities were given to the workman but in spite of giving ample opportunities the workman/union has failed to turn up and even they did not consider necessary to submit Written Statement on their behalf. Gesture of the workman/union if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that the workman/union is not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances, it is needless to adjourn the case *suo moto* for days together. Accordingly, a 'No dispute' Award is rendered and the instant reference is disposed of on the basis of 'No dispute' Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का० आ० 1768.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 124/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-04 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल० 20012/156/2000-आई०आर०(सी-I)]
एन०पी० केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1768.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 124/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and

their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-04

[No. L-20012/156/2000-IR (C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, AT
DHANBAD**

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 124 OF 2000

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL and their workman.

Appearances :

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. A. K. Sinha,
Advocate

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal.

Dated Dhanbad the 2nd June, 2004.

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act., 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/156/2000 dated 27-9-2000.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the refusal of the demand of the Union to regularise Sri Ram Chandra Rai, Attendance Clerk as Time Keeper by the management of Gopalichak Colliery, M/s. B.C.C.L. is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled and from what date?"

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared before this Tribunal. However, management side appeared through their learned Advocate. It transpires from the record that the instant reference is pending since 2000 and ample opportunities were given to the parties for filing their respective Written Statement. But in spite of giving sufficient opportunities they have failed to do so. Gesture of the parties if is considered will expose clearly that they are not interested to proceed in this case. Under such circumstances, a 'No dispute' Award is rendered and the instant reference is disposed of on the basis of 'No dispute' Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

2136 E11/04-46

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1769.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा०को०को०लि० के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 56/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 20012/10/2002-आई. आर. (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1769.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 56/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Dhanbad-II now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 05-7-2004.

[No. L-20012/10/2002-IR (C-1)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO.2) AT DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri Biswas, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 56 of 2002

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Kustore Area of M/s. BCCL and their workman

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the workman : None

On behalf of the employers : Mr. U.N. Lall, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 2nd June, 2004

AWARD

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/10/2002-IR (C-I), dated, the 15th July, 2002.

SCHEDULE

“KYA BIHAR PRADESH COLLIERY MAZDOOR CONGRESS KI BHARAT COKING COAL LIMITED, KUSTORE KSHETRA KEY PRAVANDHTANTRA SEY MANG KI KARMKAR SHRI SAHRAB ALI KO FITTER GRADE D EX. GRADE MEY NIYAMITAKIYA JAYA UCHIT EVAM NAYASANGAT HAI? YADI HAN TO KARMKAR KIS RAHAT KEY PATRA HAY TATHA KIS TARIKH SEY?

2. In this reference neither the concerned workman nor his representative appeared. Management, however, made their appearance through their learned Advocate in this case. It transpires from the record that inspite of issuance of repeated notices the concerned workman has failed to appear before this Tribunal and he also even did not consider necessary to submit any written statement. Gesture of the workman if is taken into consideration will expose clearly that he is not interested to proceed with the hearing of this case. Under such circumstances there is no reason to drag on the case further. Accordingly a 'No dispute' Award is rendered and the instant reference is disposed of on the basis of 'No dispute' Award presuming non-existence of any industrial dispute between the parties.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1770.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एअर इंडिया लि० मुम्बई के प्रबंधतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय मुम्बई-I के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 19/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-11012/37/2001-आई. आर. (सी-1)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1770.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 19/

2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I; Mumbai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Air India Ltd. Mumbai and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-07-2004.

[No. L-11012/37/2001-IR(C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO.1, MUMBAI

PRESENT:

Shri Justice S. C. Pandey, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT 19 of 2001

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Air India Ltd., Mumbai

And

Their workman Shri R.H. Sonariker

APPEARANCE:

For the Management : Shri Francis, Advocate

For the Workman : Shri Jaiprakash Sawant

State : Maharashtra

Mumbai, dated this the 18th day of June, 2004

AWARD

1. This is a reference made by the Central Government to this Industrial Tribunal in exercise of its powers under clause (d) of sub-section 1 and sub-section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for passing an award after adjudication of the industrial dispute between the Air India Ltd. and their workman Ravindra H. Sonariker in the following terms.

"Whether the action of the management of Air India Ltd. in dismissing Sh. Ravindra H Sonariker from service w.e.f. 4-5-99 is just, fair and legal? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. This Tribunal has already passed the order dated 15-6-2004 in the approval application No. NTB-65 of 1999. This Tribunal has declined to grant approval to order dated 4-5-1999 whereby the workman was dismissed. The consequence of order dated 15-6-2004 is that the dismissal order did not survive from the date it was passed by the Air India Ltd.

3. In view of the aforesaid position in law, this reference is disposed of by stating that industrial dispute referred to this Tribunal does not survive.

4. Let the order dated 15-06-2004 in approval application No. NTB-65 of 1999 be part of the record of the case.

S. C. PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1771.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा.को.को.लि. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-I के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 225/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/125/98-आई. आर. (सी-I)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1771.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947); the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 225/98) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I; Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-07-2004.

[No.L-20012/125/98-IR(C-I)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1) (d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 225 of 1998

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Nudkharkee Colliery of Block-II Area of M/S B. C. C. Ltd.

And

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :—

For the Employers	: Shi R.N. Ganguly, Advocate
For the Workman	: Shri N.G. Arun, Representative of the workmen
State	: Jharkhand
Industry	: Coal

Dated, the 17th June, 2004

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/125/98-IR(C-I) dated 1-12-1998 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal;

"Whether the denial of the management to protect the wages of S/Shri Jagdhari Das, Ramanand Chowhan, Omilal Shaw, Salchand Bhar, Birju Bhar, Usman Ansari and Pawaru Chowhan is justified? if not, to what the concerned workmen are entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workmen according to the written statement submitted by the sponsoring union on their behalf, in brief, is as follow :

The sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workmen were permanent employees engaged as miner/ loader in piece-rated Group-IV-A. They submitted that the management according to their own requirement sometime in 1990 engaged the concerned workmen alongwith another workman, Surajdeo Dusadh to perform duties of Tyndal in the underground for the whole of 1990. Thereafter the management by an office order dated 24-1-1991 confirmed them as Tyndal in time rate under control of Manager, Nudkhurkes Colliery. They alleged that while confirming the worker as Tyndals did not protect their pay and allowances and simply placed them in Category-IV time rate causing financial loss in existing pay scale as well as for future benefits to be accounted for from earnings. They disclosed that it is a condition of service that the workmen should not suffer loss of earning from change of service condition from one job to another and from one place to another. They disclosed that the management though gave pay protection to Surajdeo Dusadh by office order dated

24-1-91 did not consider necessary to pass the same order in favour of the concerned workmen illegally, arbitrarily and violating the principle of natural justice. Accordingly, they submitted their prayer to pass award directing the management to pay wages with due protection to the concerned workman w.e.f 24-1-91 and also be placed in proper category of employment.

3. The management, on the contrary, after filing written statement-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the written statement on behalf of the concerned workman. They submitted that the concerned workmen were piece-rated minor/loader in the underground mine of Nudkhurkee Colliery which got closed on account of various mining problems in the year 1991. Consequent upon closure of the said underground mine the underground workers deployed therein were transferred to different mines to work in their respective capacities maintaining the condition of service unaltered in all respects. In the instant case the concerned workmen refused to carry out the order of transfer and insisted on the management through powerful union for their deployment on the surface in the Block-II area. As a result of such pressure of the union, the management provided them alternate job as Tyndals. they disclosed that the piece rated workers draw wages as per decision of NCWA in different groups with minimum guaranteed wages as well as fall-back wages subject to the condition that they may earn higher amount by doing more work on the job allotted to them. The piece-rated workers have been divided into several groups and for each group specific amount have been fixed as minimum guaranteed wages and fall-back wages. Depending the nature of jobs performed by each piece-rated worker, he gets the amount computed on the fixed rate as per the work load. Therefore, the piece-rated workers have no fixed rate of wages and he can only claim of minimum guaranteed wages or the fall back wages of different groups on which he has been permanently absorbed. If a piece-rated worker is not been permanently absorbed in any specific group, he gets the wages of different groups according to nature of job performed by him.

They submitted that the concerned workmen demanded for their regularisation on time-rated job where they were deployed on alternate basis and ultimately under pressure of the union they were compelled to regularise them as Tyndal category-IV which was carrying higher wages than the minimum guaranteed wages of group I to Group-IV, keeping in view the general principles

of wage fixation and at that time the concerned workman did not raise any objection against such fixation. They submitted that after lapse of long years the sponsoring union has made out the present case demanding protection of wages without specifying the particular details. Accordingly, they submitted that the claim is vague, absurd and for which the same is to be rejected summarily.

POINTS TO BE DECIDED

4. "Whether denial of the management to protect the wages of S/Shri Jagdhari Das, Ramanand Chowhan, Omilal Shaw, Salchand Bhar, Birju Bhar, Usman Answare and Pawaru Chowhan is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled?"

Finding with reasons

5. It transpires from the record that the sponsoring union which a view to substantiate their claim examined one witness as WW-1. The management with a view to substantiate their claim examined one witness as MW-1 considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings and also considering the evidence of WW-1 and MW-1 I find no dispute to hold that initial designation of the concerned workmen was miner/loaders at Nudkharkee Colliery. It is admitted fact that the said colliery was declared closed on account of various mining problem in the year 1991. The contention of the management is that after closure of the said colliery underground workers of that colliery were transferred to other collieries in the same capacity. The concerned workmen were underground miner/loader, but they refused to go to any other colliery on transfer in spite of closure of the colliery. On the contrary, they created pressure to work on the surface of the said colliery. However, in course of hearing the management has failed to establish that under pressure of the union they were forced to keep them in the said colliery and provided them the work of Tyndals on the surface. From the evidence of MW-1 it transpires that the management engaged them as Tyndals in the year 1990. This witness disclosed that on 24-1-1991 their services were confirmed in the post of Tyndals by the management and provided them Category-IV wages. This witness, who is one of the concerned workman, during his evidences disclosed further that prior to their engagement as Tyndals they used to perform the job of miner/loader on piece-rated basis, while there engagement to work as Tyndals was on time-rated basis. He alleged that inspite of their engagement as Tyndal by the management on time-rated basis w.e.f 24-1-1991 they refused to give them any pay protection. He disclosed that as miner/loader they used to draw wages at the rate of

Rs. 88.38 per day inclusive of all allowances. In spite of this fact the management fixed their wages at the initial stage of Category-IV wages. Accordingly, he submitted that they are entitled to get pay protection when they were engaged in time-rated job from piece-rated job, but the management refused to give any pay protection to them.

I have carefully considered the order dated 24-1-1991 issued by the management relying on which the concerned workmen are claiming their regularisation as Tyndal in time-rated. The office order speaks as follows:

"The following underground loaders who completed 190 days attendance in underground as Tyndal are hereby allowed to report for their duties as Tyndal to the manager, Nudkharkee Colliery with immediate effect."

It is clear from the evidence on record of both sides that the concerned workmen were underground miner/loader of Nudkharkee Colliery and the said colliery was closed in the year 1990. Accordingly, all the underground workmen of that colliery were transferred to different collieries as per their category excepting the concerned workmen. Accordingly, the question of their working in the underground as Tyndal never arose as they used to discharge their duties in the underground as piece-rated miner/loader. It is seen that the job of Tyndals were provided to the concerned workmen on the surface of Nudkharkee Colliery by the management. It is really ridiculous to say that the management designated them as underground Tyndal for which they were asked to report for their duties as Tyndals to the Manager of Nudkharkee Colliery with immediate effect. However, as it is not the case of the sponsoring union as well as the concerned workmen that they worked in the underground as Tyndal I do not like to go in details in this regard. It is the claim of the concerned workmen relying on this order marked as Ext. W-1 that they were confirmed in the post of Tyndal by the management. From this order I do not find any whisper that the management confirmed the concerned workmen to the post of Tyndal. The representative of the concerned workmen in course of hearing has failed to satisfy me relating to the claim made by the concerned workmen/sponsoring union that they were confirmed by the management as Tyndal by order dated 24-1-91 (Ext. W-1). Accordingly there is little scope to give importance to the claim of the sponsoring union/ concerned workmen in this regard. It is seen from the order dated 29-11-95/9-12-95 (Ext. W-3) that the concerned workmen were regularised in time-rated category from piece-rated category as Tyndal from their

previous category of miner/loader. Therefore, it is clear that the concerned workmen were regularised in the time-rated category of Tyndal with effect from the date mentioned above and not w.e.f. 24-1-91 which was claimed by them. It is further seen that after the concerned workmen were converted to time-rated Tyndal they were placed in category-IV and their wages were fixed at Rs. 70.30 per day. The dispute crops up from this place. It is the contention of the sponsoring union that as per service condition the workmen should not suffer loss of earning from change of service condition from one job to another and from one place to another. WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that while they used to work as piece-rated miner/loader they would draw wages at the rate of Rs. 88.38 per day inclusive of all allowances. Disclosing this fact he submitted that while the management fixed their wage at the initial stage of Category-IV their wage came down to Rs. 70.30 per day. It is their allegation that inspite of repeated representation the management refused to give any pay protection to their wages which they used to draw while they worked as piece-rated miner/loader. On the contrary, MW-1 submitted in course of his evidence that there is no fixed rate of wage of piece-rated workers. They draw wages according to volume of work done by them. However, for their protection there is provision for minimum guaranteed wages. He categorically submitted that the concerned workmen never got more wages while they were miner/loader in comparison to their wages which they started receiving as Tyndals in Category-IV and accordingly the question of giving pay protection to the concerned workmen did not arise. As per NCWA-V revised basic wage rate for piece-rated workers w.e.f. 1-7-91 for Category-IV was fixed at Rs. 69.25 and fall back wages also was fixed at 69.25 w.e.f. 1-7-91. The representative of the concerned workmen referring clause 3.11.3 of NCWA-V submitted that the piece-rated workers are entitled to get piece-rated allowance w.e.f. 1-7-91 at the rate of Rs. 1.67 per day for Category-IV. He submitted that piece-rated workers appointed on or after 1-7-91 will also be entitled to earn the special piece-rated allowance after completion of one year continuous service in the manner time-rated workers are granted annual increment on 1/3, 1/9. There is no dispute to hold that the concerned workmen were piece-rated miner/loader. As per provision of NCWA they were entitled to get special piece-rated allowance while they discharged their duties as piece-rated miner/loader. But the NCWA-V is silent if the said special piece-rated allowance shall be merged with the wage while a worker is converted as time-rated worker in different colliery. The representative of the concerned workmen in course of hearing has failed to highlight this fact before this Tribunal that the special allowance should be merged

with the wages of time-rated worker while the said worker switched over to that category from piece-rated category. It is the contention of the concerned workmen that they used to draw wage at the rate of Rs. 88.38 per day while they discharged their duties as piece-rated worker, but after conversion as time-rated to the post of Tyndal in Category-IV their wage was fixed at Rs. 70.30 per day. The concerned workmen accordingly have claimed for pay protection of Rs. 18.08 per day. But before claiming such pay protection onus absolutely rests on the concerned workmen/sponsoring union to show that they used to draw wages at the rate of Rs. 88.38 per day as piece-rated worker. This aspect is to be considered with all importance as the question of fixation of pay has come to light. It is fact that the management fixed wages of the concerned workmen in Category-IV at the rate of Rs. 70.30 per day while they were designated as time-rated Tyndal. It is really shocking to note that in spite of claiming pay protection neither the concerned workmen nor the sponsoring union considered necessary to produce the wage slip with a view to substantiate their claim. Wage slip is to be considered as documentary evidence, in support of the claim of the concerned workmen. Therefore, when they failed to submit documentary evidence such claim cannot be substantiated by oral statement particularly when the management categorically denied the fact about receiving wages by the concerned workmen at the rate of Rs. 88.38 per day. I have failed to understand how the sponsoring union raised their claim for pay protection without being supported by any documentary evidence which are very much in their possession. Accordingly on the basis of mere oral submission I find no scope to arrive at any definite conclusion that the concerned workmen as piece-rated workers used to draw their wages at the rate of Rs. 88.38 per day as piece-rated worker and for which they are very much entitled to get pay protection while they were converted as Tyndal in time-rated Category-IV.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above I therefore find no scope to give any relief to the concerned workmen on the basis of their oral evidence in absence of any documentary evidence.

7. In the result, the following award is rendered:-

The denial of the management to protect the wages of S/Shri Jagdhari Das, Ramanand Chovhan, Omilal Shaw, Salchand Bhar, Birju Bhar, Usman Ansari and Pawaru Chowhan is justified. Accordingly, the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 7 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1772. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भा. को. को. लि. के प्रबंधन के संबंध निर्यातकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय धनबाद-II के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 28/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-7-2004 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/19/97-आई.आर. (सी-1)]

एन.पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 7th July, 2004

S.O. 1772.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 28/1998) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Dhanbad-II, now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-7-2004.

[No. L-20012/19/97-IR(C-D)]

N.P. KESAYAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d)(2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 28 of 1998

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Block-II Area of M/S. BCCL.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri B. Biswas, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers: Shri D.K. Verma, Advocate

For the Workman: Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary,
Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

State: Jharkhand. Industry: Coal.

Dated, the 18th June, 2004

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/19/97-IR(C-D) dated 27-2-1998 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-

section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

“Whether the demand of the union for the placement Shri Santosh Kumar, Helper (T) as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90 and as Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93 is justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled to?”

2. The case of the concerned workman according to the written statement submitted by the sponsoring union, in brief, is as follows:

That sponsoring union submitted that the concerned workman started working as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 29/30-11-90 at Benidih colliery of Block-II Area as per direction and authorisation of the management. They submitted that the concerned workman actually had been working as Store Keeper even prior to November, 1993 though at that time no written authorisation was issued in his favour. They submitted that as Asstt. Store Keeper the concerned workman put in more than 190/240 days attendance in each calendar year. In discharging of his duty as Asstt. Store Keeper the concerned workman used to maintain all statutory documents of the Store. Accordingly he submitted representation before the management several time for his regularisation, as per performance of job but to no effect. They submitted further that in support of the claim of the concerned workman a note-sheet also was initiated by the Supervisor of the concerned workman for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper but that too did not yield any result. They submitted that by Office Order dated 22/23-5-94 the concerned workman was asked to take the charge of Sr. Store Keeper from Bindhachal Singh who as Sr. Store Keeper was posted in the said store of Benidih colliery, as he was transferred to other colliery. They submitted that as per the said order of the management the concerned workman started discharging his duty as Sr. Store Keeper in place of permanent vacancy and accordingly he submitted representation before the management for his regularisation as Sr. Store Keeper on and from the date of performance of the job of Sr. Store Keeper. To that effect also the superior authority initiated a note-sheet for his regularisation as Sr. Store Keeper but that too did not yield any result. In the circumstances the sponsoring union on behalf of the concerned workman raised an industrial dispute before the A.L.C. (C) which ultimately resulted to reference to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The sponsoring union accordingly submitted prayer to pass an award directing the management to regularise the concerned workman as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90 and Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93 with retrospective effect and with all arrear of wages and other consequential benefits.

3. The management, on the contrary, after filing written statement-cum-rejoinder had denied all the claims and allegations which the sponsoring union asserted in the written statement on behalf of the concerned workman. They submitted that the concerned workman was appointed as Helper (Trainee) in Category-I w.e.f. 22-1-90 during his tenure of training as Helper he was given the job at different places including stores. They submitted as the concerned workman who was working as Helper (T) he was given the job of collecting store material from the regional store as helper of the authorised competent person. They submitted that he was never selected or recruited as a person in clerical cadre, and, as such, there was no scope for him to be deputed to perform the jobs of Asstt. Store Keeper either in the colliery store or in the regional store. Accordingly his claim for change of his cadre from time-rated category to clerical cadre/grade by way of regularisation is without any merit. They disclosed that BCCI has formulated the cadre scheme for store personnel under Implementation Instruction No. 34 dated 17-7-84. As per the said cadre scheme entry in the store cadre can only be effected in clerical Grade-III on the basis of selection/test of all eligible candidates within a particular area under the jurisdiction of Chief General Manager and all persons with 3 years of service in the company and holding minimum matriculation or equivalent certificate recognised by Board of Examination are eligible for consideration for their change in cadre to clerical grade in the store personnel with initial start of Grade-III. They further disclosed that the cadre scheme made it clear that the initial entry must be made through selection test by the Selection Committee and the persons in higher grades of Grade-II and above can only be promoted on the basis of recommendation of D.P.C. after fulfilment of eligibility conditions. Thus, there is uniformity in the rule of change of cadre as well as promotion to higher grades in the cadre and all kinds of regularisation by showing favouritism on the basis of influence exerted on the officers of the company by the union or by political pressure have come to an end. They submitted further that the present attempt on the part of the sponsoring union to regularise the concerned workman as Asstt. Store Keeper in clerical Grade-II superseding the provisions of cadre scheme and rules of fair play and justice is nothing but demand for regularisation of illegal and corrupt practices by superseding all rules and canons of justice. However, the management in order to avoid displeasure of the powerful union agreed to regularise the concerned workman in clerical Grade-III in the store w.e.f. 13-5-96 and accordingly he has already been regularised in clerical Grade-III. Accordingly his seniority in clerical Grade-III can only be counted w.e.f. 13-5-96 as per the cadre scheme and his case for promotion for higher grades will be considered on the basis of recommendations made by Departmental Promotion Committee as and when the occasion arises. They further submitted that the demand of the sponsoring union for placement of the concerned workman as Asstt.

Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90 and Store keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93 is without any merit and the same is liable to be summarily rejected. Accordingly, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any benefit.

Points to be decided :

4. "Whether the demand of the union for placement of Sri Santosh Kumar, Helper (T) as Asstt. Store Keeper with effect from 30-11-90 and as store Keeper Grade-I with effect from 30-11-93 is justified ? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled to ?"

Finding with reasons :

5. It transpires from the record that the sponsoring union with a view to substantiate their claim examined the concerned workman as WW-1. The management also in support of their claim examined one witness as MW-1.

Now considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides and also considering evidence of WW-1 and MW-1 I find no dispute to hold that the concerned workman got his appointment as Helper (T) in Category-I w.e.f. 22-1-90. After appointment he was placed on probation for a period of one year.

It transpires from the evidence of WW-1 that before completion of the period of probation in the month of November, 1990 he was appointed by a letter to discharge his duty as Asstt. Store Keeper. Accordingly as Asstt. Store Keeper he discharged his duty continuously from November, 1990. In course of his evidence the concerned workman has failed to produce the letter by which he was authorised to discharge his duty as Asstt. Store Keeper. WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that in the year 1992 he submitted representation for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper. In support of his claim local management also initiated a note-sheet for regularisation of his service as Asstt. Store Keeper. This witness during his evidence admitted that during the said period one Vindhyachal Singh was Sr. Store Keeper in the store of Benedih Block-II area. He disclosed that said Vindhyachal Singh got his order of transfer from Benedih Block-II area to Block-IV area in the year 1994. After his transfer the management did not post any workman there as Sr. Store Keeper and for which he was authorised to discharge his duty as Store Keeper and Sr. Store Keeper by the management and accordingly since 1994 he is discharging his duty as Store Keeper and Sr. Store Keeper continuously. His evidence therefore speaks clearly that till 1993 the concerned workman, according to his claim, discharged his duty as Asstt. Store Keeper. In spite of claiming so by raising industrial dispute the concerned workman claimed his regularisation as Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93. It is admitted fact that the concerned workman was regularised as Store Issue Clerk in clerical Grade-III from the post of helper of Benedih O.C.P. vide order No. BCCL/O & M/RegIn-Clk 96/258 dated 28-3-96 (Ext. M-1).

MW-1 on the contrary during his evidence disclosed that the post of Asstt. Store Keeper and Store Issue Clerk are regulated under stores cadre as per N.C.W.A. He submitted that Store Issue Clerk comes under clerical Grade-III as a cadre post as per N.C.W.A. He further disclosed that Store Issue Clerk is entitled to get promotion as Asstt. Store Keeper or as Store Keeper as per N.C.W.A. only through D.P.C. This witness further disclosed that the concerned workman got his appointment as Helper (T) Category-I. Therefore, his claim for regularisation in the post of Asstt. Store Keeper or Store Keeper Grade-I cannot be possible at all directly from Helper (T) Category-I violating the provision as laid down in N.C.W.A. In support of this claim the management relied on the document, marked Ext. M-3.

I have carefully considered the document, marked Ext. M-3 i.e. cadre scheme for ministerial staff. This document has clearly pointed out how Asstt. Store Keeper, Store Keeper and Sr. Store Keeper get their promotion. It is clear from the cadre scheme that before getting promotion to Asstt. Store Keeper he must be Store Issue Clerk in clerical Grade-III and his promotion in the said post is made through selection/test. Thereafter for the post of Asstt. Store Keeper and onward senior posts the workmen are promoted as per recommendation of D.P.C.

6. It is the specific claim of the concerned workman that by a letter he was authorised by the management to discharge his duty as Asstt. Store Keeper and started discharging his duty with effect from November, 1990. In the month of January he got his appointment as Helper (T) in Category-I. He was placed on probation for a period of one year. It is really astonishing to note that before completion of the period of probation he proved himself so efficient that the management violating the provisions of NCWA and Cadre Scheme formulated as per JBCCI Circular No. 34 directly issued letter of authorisation to work as Asstt. Store Keeper. It is curious to note that neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union in course of hearing was able to produce the said letter by which he was authorised to work as Asstt. Store Keeper violating all provisions of the Cadre Scheme as per NCWA. On the contrary, it is the claim of the management that as a probationer the concerned workman was placed at different departments including at the store. The concerned workman was placed in the store finds no dispute at all, but it is the claim of the concerned workman/sponsoring union that he was placed in the store as Asstt. Store Keeper and after discharging his duties there continuously in the year 1992 he submitted representation to the management for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper. He further submitted that in support of his claim the Manager/Supdt., Benedih colliery made a note-sheet requesting the superior authority for regularisation of the concerned workman as Asstt. Store Keeper Gr. II w.e.f. 1-1-92. The said note-sheet during evidence of the concerned workman was marked Ext. W-3.

I have carefully considered the said note-sheet and from the same it transpires that the concerned workman who was Hepler (T) Category-I was authorised by the Supdt./Manager, Benedih O.C.P. for collecting of store materials from Regional Store and other Stores. The note-sheet further speaks that in addition to that work the concerned workman also used to maintain store issue ledger and accordingly made recommendation for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper. Collection of materials, according to the management, is function of the Store Boy and not by the Asstt. Store Keeper. The learned Advocate for the management further submitted in course of hearing that there was no authorisation in writing either by the Manager/Supdt., Benedih colliery or by the superior authority to the concerned workman to maintain store issue ledger etc. It is seen that the concerned workman is a matriculate. He was to assist the Store Keeper if he is allowed to maintain store issue ledger. In the circumstances there is no scope to say that he started functioning the duties of Asstt. Store Keeper. From the note-sheet it transpires that till 12-12-92 i.e. the date of issuance of the note-sheet there was Store Keeper in the store of Benedih Block-II area. Actually at that relevant time in the store Sr. Store Keeper, Store Keeper and two Store Boys were posted. No evidence is forthcoming that the post of Asstt. Store Keeper was very much in existence there though the said post remained vacant. Therefore until and unless it is established that there was post of Asstt. Store Keeper in the said store the question of discharging duties of the concerned workman as Asstt. Store Keeper did not arise, though from the note-sheet I find recommendation for regularisation of the concerned workman as Asstt. Store Keeper. According to cadre scheme for ministerial staff (Ext. M-3) the post of Asstt. Store Keeper is filled up from the Store Issue Clerk subject to full fulfilment of conditions mentioned therein and subject to his selection/test. There is sufficient reason to believe that the Manager/Supdt., Benedih colliery with some ulterior motive recommended the name of the concerned workman for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper violating all the norms as laid down in the cadre scheme of ministerial staff in the matter of giving promotion to the post of Asstt. Store Keeper. As per the said scheme it further transpires eligibility for the post of Asstt. Store Keeper occurs on completion of three years experience as Store Issue Clerk in clerical Grade-III. The concerned workman was only Helper (T) in Category-I during the period in question and the Manager/Supdt., Benedih colliery admitted this facts in the note-sheet. Therefore, there is sufficient reason to believe that the said Manager, Benedih colliery was otherwise interested and for which he recommended the name of the concerned workman for his promotion as Asstt. Store Keeper which accordingly to cadre scheme could not at all be fisible. The concerned workman claimed his further promotion as Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93 for his discharging duties as Asstt. Store Keeper since 1990. The Cadre Scheme (Ext. M-3)

has specifically pointed out how Store Keeper and Sr. Store Keeper are promoted. The concerned workman has failed to establish that he discharged his duties as Asstt. Store Keeper since 1990 and in that capacity he completed his service continuously for three years. WW-1 during his evidence disclosed that Sr. Store Keeper, Vindhachal Singh was transferred to Block-IV area in the year 1994. He submitted that at that time he was asked by the management to discharge his duty as Sr. Store Keeper and Store Keeper and in support of this claim he relied on the document marked Ext. W-1. Ext. W-1 speaks that the said Vindhachal Singh was asked to hand over charge of the store to the concerned workman. But the concerned workman has failed to produce any letter of authority to show that after taking over charge he was authorised to discharge the function of Sr. Store Keeper knowing fully well of the fact that he was Helper (T) Category-I. Therefore, relying on this letter marked Ext. W-1 there is no scope at all to draw any conclusion that the concerned workman being a helper (T) Category-I was allowed to discharge his duty as Sr. Store Keeper and Store Keeper i.e. it shows clearly that at that relevant time being Helper (T) Category-I he was in charge of Asstt. Store Keeper, Store Keeper and Sr. Store Keeper in the store of Benedih Block-II area. The note-sheet (Ext. W-3) further speaks that recommendation was made for regularisation of the concerned workman w.e.f. 1-1-92. On the contrary, the concerned workman claimed his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90. The concerned workman was appointed as Helper (T) in the month of January, 1990 and he was placed on probation for one year i.e. after rendering his service only for ten months as Helper (T) on probation, he claimed his regularisation in the post of Asstt. Store Keeper. On us absolutely rests on the concerned workman to justify his claim but I find no hesitation to say that the sponsoring union have failed to justify the claim lamentably. If the procedure of cadre scheme is taken into consideration I find no hesitation to say that it is absurd to support the claim of the concerned workman for his regularisation as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90 and Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93.

7. Learned Advocate for the concerned workman in support of the claim of the concerned workman relied on a decision in connection with Civil Appeal No. 179 (NL) of 1983 between Workmen employed by Hindustan Lever Ltd. Vs. Hindustan Lever Limited. I have considered the decision referred above. In the said decision their Lordships in para 7 observed—

“Since the introduction of the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 (1946 Act for short), it has been made obligatory for the employer in an industrial establishment to prepare a draft of standing orders and get them certified under the Act. Sec. 4 of the 1946 Act, requires the employer to make provision in the standing orders for every matter set out in the Schedule which is applicable to the industrial

establishment. The Schedule provides amongst other for making provision in the standing orders for classification of workman, for example, whether permanent, temporary, apprentice, probationers or badlis. This classification of workmen by the employer is thus made obligatory and has to be provided for in the standing order. It is also wellsettled that certified standing orders which have a statutory flavour prescribe the conditions of service and they shall be deemed to be incorporated in the contract of employment of each workman with his employer. *Sudhir Chandra Sarkar V. Tata Iron and steel Co. Ltd.* It would therefore following as a Corollary that the employee will have to classify the workmen and failure to classify would be violative of the 1946 Act. Now is there is a statutory obligation to classify workmen under the 1946 Act, the classification would be permanent, temporary, apprentices, probationers and all other known categories such of celing, officiating etc.”

The dispute in the instant case as I find was for confirmation of employees promoted to the higher grade and acting in the higher grade for more than 3 months. In other word, the demand for classification of workmen officiating in the higher grades either as permanent or temporary and they should not be continued indefinitely as temporary by making them permanent on rendering of continuous service in the higher grade for a period of three months. The demand involves both the classification of employees and classification by grade. Here in the instant case the concerned workman got his employment as Category-I General Mazdoor. It is his claim that he was allowed to work as Store Keeper in the store by the management and for which he has claimed for regularisation as he is rendering his service in that capacity for years together. The concerned workman in course of hearing has failed to show that after getting promotion as Store Keeper he started discharging his duty there from Category-I Mazdoor. No evidence is also forth coming that since joining as Store Keeper he is enjoying the wages of that grade. I have already discussed above that the post of Store Keeper is a cadre post and as per NCWA there is clear verdict how the post of Store Keeper can be filled up. As it is a cadre post there is no scope at all to get promotion directly from Category-I Mazdoor by any workman. For getting that post he must have to pass through some procedure as enunciated. Accordingly, relying on the said decision as referred to above there is no scope at all to draw conclusion that after getting promotion as Store Keeper he was allowed to work there as acting Store Keeper and the management discriminated in regularising him. Accordingly, I am not at par with the submission of the learned Advocate for the concerned workman.

8. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above I hold that the sponsoring union have lamentably failed to establish the claim of the concerned workman and for which the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief in view of his prayer.

9. In the result, the following award is rendered—

The demand of the union for the placement of Shri Santosh Kumar, Helper (T) as Asstt. Store Keeper w.e.f. 30-11-90 and Store Keeper Grade-I w.e.f. 30-11-93 is not justified. Hence, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief.

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1773.—जबकि, मैसर्स एल एण्ड टी नीरो लिमिटेड (जीजे/बीडी/21006) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के रूप में उल्लिखित) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम के रूप में उल्लिखित) की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) के अन्तर्गत छूट के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और जबकि, केन्द्र सरकार के विचार में अंशदान की दरों के संबंध में उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के भविष्य निधि नियम उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 में उल्लिखित की तुलना में कर्मचारियों के लिए कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं और कर्मचारी अन्य भविष्य निधि लाभों का भी फायदा उठा रहे हैं कुल मिलाकर इसी प्रकार के किसी अन्य प्रतिष्ठान में कर्मचारियों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत अथवा कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 (इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम के रूप में उल्लिखित) के अन्तर्गत प्रदान किए जा रहे लाभों की तुलना में कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं;

अतः, अब, केन्द्र सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और समय-समय पर इस संबंध में केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा उल्लिखित शर्तों के अधधीन एतद्द्वारा 01-10-1997 से उक्त प्रतिष्ठान को उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबंधों के प्रचालन से अगली अधिसूचना जारी होने तक छूट प्रदान करती है।

[सं. एस-35015/8/2004-एसएस-II]

संयुक्ता राय, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2004

S.O. 1773.—Whereas M/s. L&T Niro Limited (GJ/BD/21006) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) has applied for exemption under clause (a) of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas in the opinion of the Central Government the rules of the provident fund of the said establishment with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable to employees therein than those specified in section 6 of the said Act and the employees are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits provided under the said Act or under the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said scheme) in relation to the employees in any other establishment of similar character.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said

Act, subject to the conditions specified in this regard from time to time, the Central Government, hereby, exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme with effect from 1-10-1997, until further notification.

[No. S-35015/8/2004-SS-II]

SANJUKTA RAY, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1774.—जबकि, मैसर्स एल एण्ड टी छियोदा लिमिटेड (जीजे/बीडी/21007) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के रूप में उल्लिखित) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम के रूप में उल्लिखित) की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) के अन्तर्गत छूट के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और जबकि, केन्द्र सरकार के विचार में अंशदान की दरों के संबंध में उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के भविष्य निधि नियम उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 में उल्लिखित की तुलना में कर्मचारियों के लिए कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं और कर्मचारी अन्य भविष्य निधि लाभों का भी फायदा उठा रहे हैं कुल मिलाकर इसी प्रकार के किसी अन्य प्रतिष्ठान में कर्मचारियों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत अथवा कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 (इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम के रूप में उल्लिखित) के अन्तर्गत प्रदान किए जा रहे लाभों की तुलना में कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं;

अतः, अब, केन्द्र सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और समय-समय पर इस संबंध में केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा उल्लिखित शर्तों के अधधीन एतद्द्वारा 01-12-96 से उक्त प्रतिष्ठान को उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबंधों के प्रचालन से अगली अधिसूचना जारी होने तक छूट प्रदान करती है।

[सं. एस-35015/7/2004-एसएस-II]

संयुक्ता राय, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2004

S.O. 1774.—Whereas M/s. L&T Chiyoda Limited (GJ/BD/21007) (herein after referred to as the said establishment) has applied for exemption under clause (a) of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas in the opinion of the Central Government the rules of the provident fund of the said establishment with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable to employees therein than those Specified in section 6 of the said Act and the employees are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits provided under the said Act or under the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme) in relation to the employees in any other establishment of similar character.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said

Act and subject to the conditions specified in this regard from time to time, the Central Government, hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme with effect from 1-12-1996, until further notification.

[No. S-35015/7/2004-SS-II]

SANJUKTA RAY, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1775.—जबकि, मैसर्स एल एण्ड टी सार्जेंट एण्ड लुंडी लिमिटेड (जीजे/बीडी/21008) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के रूप में उल्लिखित) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि एवं प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) (इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम के रूप में उल्लिखित) की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) के अन्तर्गत छूट के लिए आवेदन किया है।

और जबकि, केन्द्र सरकार के विचार में अंशदान की दरों के संबंध में उक्त प्रतिष्ठान के भविष्य निधि नियम उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 में उल्लिखित की तुलना में कर्मचारियों के लिए कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं और कर्मचारी अन्य भविष्य निधि लाभों का भी फायदा उठा रहे हैं कुल मिलाकर इसी प्रकार के किसी अन्य प्रतिष्ठान में कर्मचारियों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत अथवा कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 (इसके पश्चात् उक्त स्कीम के रूप में उल्लिखित) के अन्तर्गत प्रदान किए जा रहे लाभों की तुलना में कम अनुकूल नहीं हैं।

अतः, अब, केन्द्र सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और समय-समय पर इस संबंध में केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा उल्लिखित शर्तों के अधधीन एतद्वारा 01-12-96 से उक्त प्रतिष्ठान को उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबंधों के प्रचालन से अगली अधिसूचना जारी होने तक छूट प्रदान करती है।

[सं. एस-35015/9/2004-एसएस-II]

संयुक्ता राय, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2004

S.O. 1775.—Whereas M/s. L&T Sargent and Lundy Limited (GJ/BD/21008) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) has applied for exemption under clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act).

And whereas in the opinion of the Central Government the rules of the provident fund of the said establishment with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable to employees therein than those specified in section 6 of the said Act and the employees are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits provided under the said Act or under the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said scheme) in relation to the employees in any other establishment of similar character.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in this regard from time to time, the Central Government, hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the

provisions of the said Scheme with effect from 1-12-1996, until further notification.

[No. S-35015/9/2004-SS-II]

SANJUKTA RAY, Under Secy.

शुद्धि पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 2004

का. आ. 1776.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 और साथ ही, इस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या एल-42012/1/97-आई.आर. (डी.यू.), दिनांक 30-4-2004 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण-II, नई दिल्ली के दिनांक 11-6-2004 के पंचाट, औद्योगिक विवाद संख्या 3/98 के संदर्भ में शुद्धि पत्र प्रकाशित करती है।

[सं. एल-42012/1/97-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 12th July, 2004

S.O. 1776.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) and in continuation of this Ministry's Notification No. L-42012/1/97-IR (DU) dated 30-4-2004 the Central Government hereby publishes the corrigendum dated 11-6-2004 in award reference ID No. 3/98 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal II, New Delhi.

[No. L-42012/1/97-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II

RAJENDRA BHAWAN, GROUND FLOOR, RAJENDRA PLACE, NEW DELHI

In the Court of Sh. R. N. Rai, Presiding Officer, CGIT-Cum-Labour Court-II, New Delhi.

I.D. No. 3/98

In the matter of

Sh. M. N. Singh

V/s.

CPWD.

Corrigendum

The 5th line of the concluding para of the award dated 26-4-2004 in the industrial dispute mentioned above is to be read as

"the workman is entitled to be reinstated from 3-3-1993 instead of 1-3-1988".

Dated: 11-6-04

R. N. RAI, Presiding Officer